Tho: Wright. 1784.

AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST THE VENOME OF The Snake in the Grass: Or, the Book so stiled.

AND THE

Christian People CALLED QUAKERS

Vindicated from its most gross

Abuses and Calumnies.

In certain *Reflections*, detecting the nameless Author's Malice, Outrage and Persecution against the said People.

Unto which is Annex'd,

A brief Examination of the Author's second Book, stil'd, *Satan Dis-rob'd.*

Also, Some Notice taken of his Discourse for the *Divine Institution* of *Water-Baptism.*

Psal. 83. 3. *They devise deceitful Matters against them that are quiet in the Land.*

London: Printed for *Tho. Northcott*, in *George-yard* in *Lombard-street.* 1697.

1659
W59

THE BOOKSELLER TO THE READER.

Friendly Reader,

THE *ſo long delay of this Anſwer to* **The Snake in the Graſs,** *has been chiefly the Printers occaſion, and partly to have ſome Anſwer to his latter Book, ſtil'd,* **Satan Diſrob'd.**

So, Reader, that thou may'ſt be preſerved from the Venom of this Snake, in all his twiſtings and twinings, is the deſire of him, who wiſheth the Well-fare of all Men.

T. N.

ERRATA.

PAge 39. l. 13. r. *Persecutors* l. 38. dele *as* p. 56. l. 6. r. *Kingdoms*, p. 81. l. 1. r. *Prosecution*, p. 166. l. 30. for *them in* r. *in them*, p. 167. l. 12. for *reprobaches* r. *reproaches*, p. 200. l. 23. r. *universally*, p. 204. l. 7. r. *who rendred*, p. 232. l. 41. r. *of Sin and Death*, l. 5. r. *of Life*, p. 235. l. 13. d. 60.

Some litteral Faults and Points mis-placed, may be understood by the sense of the matters.

Im-

Impartial Reader,

AFter the peruſal of the ſaid *Snake in the Graſs*, ſeeing the groſs and abſurd Aſperſions, Calumnies, Perverſions and ſcornful Stuff therein Contained, and the great Malice of the nameleſs Author's Spirit againſt the People called Quakers; It was ſlighted by us and laid aſide for ſome Months, being ſtuft with many lying and incredible Stories, as ſcarce deſerving any particular Anſwer, except the notice of ſome few to diſcredit the Author and invalidate his fruitleſs attempts of his foul Envy and Falſhood: But ſome indifferent Perſons being urgent for an Anſwer, and the ſaid Book being rendred as an unanſwerable Piece, by ſome too eaſily impoſed upon, and others in prejudice gave occaſion for the inſuing *Reflections* to be Exhibited, in order to obviate the injurious Deſign of the Author and his Abettors (*i. e.*) ſome wrathful, implacable and perfidious Apoſtates,

who are of thoſe Cattle he has principally Plowed withal, and from whom he has chiefly derived his unjuſt Authority to Defame and Scandalize the ſaid People, with thoſe old, falſe and refuted Aſperſions and Slanders, as *Poſſeſſed with the Devil*, *Enthuſiaſtick Madneſs*, *Blaſphemy*, *Hereſie*, *denying the true Chriſt and his holy Humanity or Manhood*, *real Sufferings and Satisfaction*, and *the Reſurrection*, and *Contemning the Holy Scriptures*, *Doctrins* and *Precepts* therein contained, with abundance more of ſuch like Calumnies and Slanders, Abuſes and Perverſions (of our Words and Doctrins) frequently anſwered and refuted by divers of us in our former and latter Books. And now becauſe of our preſent Eaſe and Liberty, which Mercy our Gracious God hath influenced the preſent Government to afford us, from our late grievous and deſtructive Perſecutions, (for which Liberty we are truly thankful.) For this Cauſe the Devil and his Agents appear the more enraged and to have exceeding great Wrath againſt the remnant of the true Seed, and to combine together to perſecute us, with their moſt ſhameful Reproaches, Abuſes, Lyes and Slanders, which is the preſent Perſecution we are under. When the Devil was ſuffered to imploy his Agents to Oppreſs and Perſecute us in our Perſons and Eſtates, by ſevere Impriſonments

ments and ſpoil of Goods, tending to Ruin us and our Families, then the Pens of his Clerks and Miniſters were quiet towards us: But ſeeing his and their wicked ends by that kind of open and cruel Perſecution could not be accompliſhed upon us; now they bend their perverſe Studies and Pens to perſecute us with ſhameful Reproach and Blaſphemy, to Deſtroy and Murther our Reputations both as Men and Chriſtians, not ſparing either the Living or the Dead. The Lord our God will rebuke their Fury and Outrage, and confound their miſchievous Devices and Confederacies; even the juſt and righteous God (who by his power ſupported us under our deepeſt Sufferings and Perſecutions, and gave us Faith and Courage then to Face the ſevereſt Storms and Bluſtering Winds which roſe up againſt us for our Chriſtian Teſtimony and Aſſemblies) he hath enabled and will enable us to face and outface this Storm of envious and outragious Perſecution of our open and ſecret Enemies. And 'tis no ſmall ſhame and diſparagement for ſuch Eminent Church of *England* Men (as the Author of *the Snake in the Graſs* would ſeem one of them) to be beholding to pretended Quakers, ſuch as, *George Keith* and *Thomas Criſp*, for their Aid or Authority againſt us; and to *F. Bugg*'s Authority alſo, who has been detected of numerous Falſ-

hoods againſt us, ſince he left us, and turned to the Prieſts and to the Publick (as he calls it) and the ſaid *George Keith* contrary to his many and frequent Vindications of the People called Quakers and their Principles, and above thirty Years Converſation among them, now turned an open Adverſary to Revile and Reproach them, and yet a falſly pretended Quaker, as if he would ingratiate himſelf into favour with the worſt of our Enemies; the Day will yet further diſcover him and them.

I confeſs, where Perſons of a contrary Judgment to us, appear moderate and civil in their Diſcourſe and Treatment, in things wherein they differ from us, they deſerve to be gently and tenderly Anſwered and Treated; and if ſuch ſuppoſe me miſtaken in any thing or circumſtance of words, (from which I intend not altogether to excuſe my ſelf in all Controverſies from my young and early Years, and yet be aſſured by the Spirit of Truth in matters Eſſential to Salvation) I would take kindly their civil and friendly Diſcovery thereof to me, being deſirous that the Truth may be exalted above all Self-reputation. But when I find Perſons like this Author of *The Snake in the Graſs*, maliciouſly ſet in a *perſecuting Spirit*, to defame and reproach Truth and our Chriſtian So-

ciety,

ciety, which I am concerned in Conſcience for.

I confeſs then, a holy Zeal the Lord raiſes, and has raiſed in my very Heart and Soul, againſt ſuch bitter Implacable and Perſecuting Spirits. And the Lord's Power I have felt, and do ſtill feel it to accompany and inable me in Defence of his bleſſed Truth and People.

And inasmuch as the ſaid Author of *The Snake in the Graſs*, is ſo very liberal in his moſt odious Characters upon us, and has ſo frequently Branded us, even divers Perſons by Name with *Blaſphemies* and *Hereſies*, &c. who have been, and are known to be Perſons of good Reputation, both as Men and Chriſtians in Life and Converſation: 'Tis pity but this Defaming Author, ſhould be publickly expoſed by Name for his Folly and outrage, eſpecially if he perſiſts in his Scorn and envious injurious attempts againſt us, that he may not be ſuffered to ſculk and hide himſelf like a Snake under Graſs.

And as to the ſeven Queries, which he upbraids us with, reproaching us, *As puting them all off with one general Anſwer*, &c. *as a trick and deceit of ours, to hide and cover our monſtrous Hereſies, and a full confeſſion of our Hereſies*, Pref. *p.* 350. Which being monſtrous Calumnies, and from which our general Anſwer to the unprejudiced, clears us, though

though we expected it would meet with such ill Treatment and Mis-construction, as it hath from *G. K.* and this Author; therefore thought meet to publish the said Answer herewith, for the information of others more Charitable and Impartial, than this our present Accuser and unjust Judge. The said Queries appear to be of so little weight, and some of them so indirect and in unscriptural Terms, and perversly designed for cavil, that I do not think they deserve to be reprinted here. The following Answer being positive, plain and scriptural, as well as comprehensive, of what's necessary to be said to the matters chiefly Questioned.

And tho' I have long had a more particular Answer to the said Queries ready, I do not think my self obliged at present, to gratifie such imperious arbitrary Inquisitors as our present Adversaries with the publication thereof; but rather for farther information in these matters chiefly Queried, refer them and others, to these our Books, *viz.*

First, *A Testimony of what we believe of Christ, both as he was God and Man,* &c. *By* G. F. *Printed,* Anno 1677. And,

Secondly, *The Christian Doctrin and Society of the People called Quakers,* &c. And,

Thirdly, *The Harmony of the Old and New Testament, concerning our Lord and Saviour*

viour Jesus Christ, &c. With many more ancient Books, whereby it may appear, that we were not to seek our Faith, concerning *Jesus and the Resurrection*, before the said Queries came to our hands.

G. W.

Friend

Lon. 3d day 4th Month call'd June, 1695.

Friend William Lancaſter,

HAving received a Paper of great Objections againſt us, the People called Quakers, with ſeven Queries therein, ſubſcribed William Lancaſter, directed to our Yearly Meeting in Whitſon-week, 1695. and delivered to ſome of us very near the concluſion thereof, and therefore only read in the ſaid Meeting, with not having any further time to conſider the Contents thereof, or to give any particular anſwer thereunto: It was by the ſaid Meeting left to a few to conſider and anſwer, as in the Fear of God and Meekneſs of Wiſdom we ſhould ſee Cauſe. Wherein we obſerve is noted, great Objections have been made againſt us, by thoſe who have departed from our Communion as by others.

To which we reply, that 'tis true, and they have been anſwer'd, to which we refer. And we obſerve in the ſaid Paper its ſaid, We would not take an account of you only from your Adverſaries, &c. And we have choſen this ſolemn Time. And again, And we have choſen this moſt proper and convenient Opportunity, &c. And then ſtates the ſeveral Queries, and ſays, the Queſtions may be propoſed, and their Anſwer demanded.

Now the Objections having been publick, and our Anſwers publick, we deſire to know, who the

the We are, that are intended in this Paper, that we may apply our ſelves to them, or give ſuch Scriptural Anſwers, as we hope may tend to ſatisfaction. But to repeat Anſwers in writing or print to we know not who, ſo often as demanded, to the ſame things already anſwer'd, We think it not needful. Therefore have herewith only ſent thee a few brief Lines, being groſly Wronged and Miſrepreſented in the ſaid Objections, and divers of the Queries contain ſeveral Queſtions in them, in different Terms (and ſome Unſcriptural) ſo not plain and direct Queries, therefore cannot poſitively be anſwer'd by our ſimple YEA or NAY, to each Query as deſigned. We therefore at preſent ſend this general Anſwer to the Queries for thy information as follows, viz.

We ſincerely believe and profeſs Jeſus Chriſt and the Reſurrection according to the Holy Scripture Teſtimony, and to that meaſure of Underſtanding which God hath been pleaſed to give us by his Holy Spirit.

We ſincerely believe in Jeſus Chriſt, the only begotten Son of the living God, both as he is true God, and perfect Man; our Emanuel and Mediator and as in the fulneſs of Time, he was Conceiv'd by the Holy Ghoſt, Born of the Virgin Mary in Bethlehem of Judea; Suffer'd under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified and put to Death; was Buried, roſe again the third Day, and viſibly Aſcended into Heaven, and was received

into

into Glory; and that this same Jesus Christ that was Crucified, shall so in like manner come (as he was seen to go into Heaven) in Power and great Glory to Judge both the Living and the Dead, according to their Works at the last and great Day of Judgment, in that great Harvest which is the End of the World.

And that by Jesus Christ there shall be a Resurrection of the Dead, both of the Just and Unjust unto the righteous Judgment of the great Day; consequently, that the Resurrection is not past, as Hymeneus *and* Philetus *said,* 2 Tim. 2. 18.

And that the Dead shall be raised incorruptible, Every Man in his own order, and that our low Body shall be changed, and made like unto Christ's glorious Body: *The Resurrection of the Bodies of the Saints* (We Believe) *shall be Spiritual and Glorious, and that the Sons of God, and of the Resurrection shall be equal with the Angels of God in Heaven, and shine as the Sun in the Kingdom of their Father; and yet there is such a great Mystery in the Resurrection, as that* Flesh and Blood cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth Corruption inherit Incorruption, 1 *Cor.* 15.

The whole Sacrifice of Christ (whereof his Blood outwardly that was shed was a part) was of great Price with God for Mans Redemption: Christ's Blood that was shed without the Gates of Jerusalem, *together with the whole Sacrifice*

of

himself both of Soul and Body, was a true Propitiation and Attonement for Mans reconciliation and peace with God for remission of Sins, through a living Faith, and true Repentance (in his Name) given and wrought by his Spirit and Word of Power in Mens Hearts; whose sincere obedience to Christ, and Walking in his Light, being required of them, in order to experience Christ the Author of their eternal Salvation, and to wash them from their Sins in his own Blood. For without this true Faith, Repentance and Obedience to Christ Jesus, Men lose and forfeit the great Benefit of Christs Sufferings, and deprive themselves of the Eternal Redemption and Salvation, which he hath hereby obtain'd for us. Tho' he dyed for all Men, tasted death for every Man, and gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified of in due time, being a true Propitiation for the Sins of the World.

From thy Friends and Well-wishers,

John Gratton.
Samuell Wattson.
Thomas Lower.
James Parke.
John Bowater.
George Witehead.
John Vaughton.

AN

AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST THE VENOME OF The Snake in the Grass:

BEING A

Sober Caution againſt the great Malice and groſs Abuſes of the Book ſo ſtiled; and the People call'd QUAKERS defended from the ſame.

SEeing the nameleſs Author gives his Book the Title of *The Snake in the Graſs; or, Satan tranſform'd into an Angel of Light*; which Character he intends for the *principal Leaders of thoſe People called Quakers.*

kers. It may be obſerved (by the way) what other Characters, Charges and Languages he gives the ſaid People, and treats them with all in his ſaid Book, *viz.*

Preface, p. 7, 8, 9, 17. *Falſe Prophets, mad Enthuſiaſm, obſtinate Quakers, their Rage, their Folly, rank wild Blaſphemy, proud blaſphemous Spirit, black-Mouth'd helliſh Venom, Coujurers, Witchcraft and Conjuration*; p. 19. *whatever the Power of the Devil may be in ſuch caſes,* &c. *There never were more viſible and dreadful Effects of it, in not in any poſſeſs'd Men mentioned in the Goſpel, than has been among the Quakers,* p. 21. *even as declared and witneſſed by themſelves, and that not only as to the ſtrange and preternatural Diſtortions, Quaking and Shaking of their Bodies, paſt the Power of any to counterfeit or to act it by their natural Strength, but what is much more horrible and exceeding all other Witchcrafts and Poſſeſſions of the Devil, that were ever heard of before; theſe poſſeſs'd Quakers do impiouſly blaſpheme and call themſelves Chriſt; and ſome of them have imitated his Paſſion, Death*

Death and Reſurrection, madly in themſelves.

We may hence obſerve, Firſt, the Authors moſt unjuſt and falſly reflecting theſe black Characters and Charges upon the Quakers. Secondly, How he ſhews Satan transform'd into an Angel of Light: When and where did he ever ſee or read of an Angel of Light, thus to appear, like a mad Man, a Witch, a Devil, a Blaſphemer? What horrid Madneſs, Blaſphemy and Self-contradiction, does the Devil and Malice precipitate, ſuch furious foul-Mouth'd perſecuting Agents into, at unawares? Thirdly, But if the Quakers were ſuch Madmen, and poſſeſs'd with the Devil, as he repreſents them, how well has the Man ſpent his time, in beſtowing his Wit, Drollery and Raillery (inſtead of Compaſſion) on ſuch Madmen, whoſe caſe (if ſuch) were to be lamented, rather than derided? Fourthly, For this great Madneſs and being poſſeſſed with the Devil, as 'tis caſt upon the Quakers. His inſtance (of *John Gilpin* in 1653. *James Milner*

and *John Toldervy)* p. 22, 23, 24, 30, 34. can only prove himself impertinently malicious, and can no more affect the People called Quakers, nor be any more valid Argument to prove them Madmen and Blasphemers, (since they have long since testified against the madness of those Persons he mentions) than if one should argue against the Church and Clergy of *England*, thus, *viz.* That because many of their Members have run Mad and been put into *Bedlam*, therefore the Church and Clergy of *England* are all Mad, and must be turned into *Bedlam* (if they had one big enough:) And many such other absurd Arguments and Consequences might be retalliated upon this *Snake in the Grass*, if from a Particular to a General, shall be admitted as a sound way of Arguing, which no rational Man will allow. Fifthly, His Instance (against the Quakers) of *James Nayler*'s failure, and suffering a few mad Women to sing *Hosanna* to him. This is as unjustly as maliciously remembred and cast upon us, seeing that Madness was con-

condemned and teſtified againſt by the People called Quakers. And the Lord, in mercy, made *James Nayler* himſelf ſenſible of the great Temptation and Cloud, he was, for a time, fallen under; inſomuch, that he not only gave out a publick Teſtimony of his Condition, and of the Lord's dealing with him, which was in Judgment and Mercy, and publickly expoſed under the Title of *James Nayler's Recantation*; but alſo ſome are yet alive that were both Eye-witneſſes of his many Tears and deep Humiliation, beſides his great ſuffering in Perſon by the then Government, who being reſtored into his right Underſtanding and Senſe of the Love and Mercy of God in Chriſt, ſometime after innocently ended his Days in Peace.

And therefore it ſhews, the more implacable Malice and horrid Injuſtice, to reproach us with any perſonal failing of his or any other. And not only ſo, but to reflect perſonal Miſcarriages upon our Principles: As where he thus unjuſtly infers, *viz. So very ſuſceptible do*

the Quakers Principles make Men, of the wild Impressions of Enthusiasm, p. 35. So that by this Inference, all *Gilpins*, *Milners* and *Toldervy*'s strange Whimsies, lying Imaginations and Madness, are unjustly and blasphemously father'd upon the Quakers Principles, *viz.* The *Light within*, *Revelation*, the *Infallibility*, p. 35. (which we intend of the Holy Spirit's Teaching) and no other.

6. P. 37. As for *Quaking and Trembling* so much derided; how proves he that this proceeds from *Delusion and Diabollical Possession*, p. 44. and not from the Word and Power of God, at which many good Men, both of Prophets, Apostles and Primitive Christians, have trembled? And also by the same Power, both wicked Men and Devils, have been, and shall be made to Fear, Tremble and Quake.

7. As to *such strange, preternatural Distortions* he talks of, where did he see them among the Quakers? We know not; unless some have been taken therewith, in some Convulsion-Fits; which are common to some Persons among di-

vers

vers ſorts of People; or, when by the Power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ſome evil Spirit has been about to be caſt out.

8. And how he can diſcern and judge all outward *Quaking and Trembling*, which he derides, to proceed from *a being inwardly poſſeſs'd with the Devil*; and not from the influence and opperation of the Power of Chriſt, we cannot underſtand, unleſs contrary to his Opinion againſt Infalibility, he proves his Judgment and Diſcerning Infallible, and that even in the Tryal of Spirits; wherein we cannot eſteem him ſuch a ſpiritual Man of Diſcerning, as judgeth all things.

P. 34. Again from his dark Stories of *Gilpin*, *Milner*, *Toldervy*, &c. *as in an high degree poſſeſs'd with the Devil.* He farther infers, *That there have not been among ſo many of all Mankind ſuch a nnmber (a groſs Lie) as of theſe Quakers that have run quite Mad, for their Principle is little ſhort of Madneſs.* The Principles he preſently mentions, p. 35. *Is that of expecting Revelations, and of the*

Light within. But granting that ſome pretending to Divine Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, Revelations and Light within, and from thence Infallibility in Matters of Salvation to proceed, and yet ſome ſuch have failed and run into Imagination and Deluſion. Is this any good Argument againſt the Principle it ſelf? If not, this Oppoſer's Work is only to rake up and ſet forth Perſonal Failings, which can no ways deſtroy good Principles, from whence there have been many Revolters and Backſliders, both in the Days of the Prophets, Apoſtles and Ours; and ſome becauſe when they knew God, glorified him not as God, became vain in their Imaginations, and their fooliſh Hearts thereby darkned; others begun in the Spirit, yet would end the Fleſh. But where's his Catalogue to prove a greater number of Quakers have run quite mad, than among ſo many of all Mankind? Let him produce it if he can.

Now 'tis obſervable, That our Principle of *Divine Inſpiration, Light within, the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, the Work and Mi-*

Miniſtry thereof, are plainly confeſt unto by this Author of *The Snake in the Graſs*; as '*That the Doctrin of the Church of* 'England *allows the ſame, namely, as con-* 'ſtantly *teaching that all ſaving Graces are* 'wrought *in our Hearts by the Inſpiration* 'of *the Holy Ghoſt, and that this Inſpira-* 'tion *is as neceſſary to our fructifying or* 'bringing *forth good Works, as the Influ-* 'ence *of the Sun is to the Earth's bringing* 'ing *forth of her Fruits*, p. 46, 47. Further diſcovering, '*That they do not* 'only *Teach, but alſo Pray for, and Sing* 'for *God's holy Inſpiration of the Holy* 'Ghoſt, *and plead for the neceſſity of Di-* 'vine *Inſpiration, Light within*, &c. from page 46 to page 53. And that '*accord-* 'ing *to their Homilies and Liturgy*, p. 54, 55, 56. He alſo, inſtead of confuting the Principle, or proving us all *Madmen that profeſs Divine Inſpiration*, tells us, '*What ſort of Enthuſiaſm or In-* 'ſpiration *is allowed and own'd in the* 'Church; *and that 'tis full as much as any* 'ſober *Quaker can mean by the Light with-* 'in, *and that it is made neceſſary to every* 'good *Work. And we are directed to it,*

'to

'to follow and be guided by it; and are assured, that it will lead us to all Truth 'that is requisite and necessary for our eternal Salvation; it is this that opens the 'Scriptures to us and our Understandings, 'rightly to apprehend the true Sense and 'Meaning of them, and which inclines our 'Will to love, and duly to follow the divine 'Precepts therein contained. If any Quaker (as I am confident all that are, in the 'least, sober-minded) will say, That this 'is all they mean by their Light within; 'then where is the difference? Why do they 'break off and separate from our Communion upon the pretence of the Light within, 'wherein we agree with them? pag. 55, 56, 57.

Thus far, his Confession to the Principle, wherein he is more Ingenuous than in his bitter reproachful Language and foul Raillery against us, which he somewhat minceth, yet confesseth, *He is forced to a little Raillery now and then.* Second Part, pag. 12.

The

The greater ſhame for him, thus to manifeſt himſelf an open Railer and Reviler about religious Controverſies: But ſeeing he has ſo largely confeſs'd and vindicated the Church of *England*'s allowing Preaching and Praying for the *Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*, and agreeing with the Quakers about *the Light within*, &c. how trifling and fruitleſs are his Attempts to vilifie and make them odious? as *Madmen*, *Poſſeſt with the Devil*, *Enthuſiaſtick*, *Madneſs*, &c. from the Perſonal Miſcarriages of ſome Diſtracted or Whimſical, or Mad, or looſe extravagant Perſons. How many of his own Church have run mad? How many Debauched and Wicked, both of the Clergy and others? Would he take it well to have a large Catalogue, or Book, writ thereof, as the Cobler of *Glouceſter* and others have done, to ſhew the Contempt of the Clergy, and then upbraid their whole Communion or Society, yea, and their Principles alſo, therewith? Surely no, this he would deem very unjuſt. Then let him peruſe his own Work,

and

and better conſider the Nature and Tendency thereof, together with the bitter Invectives therein, tending to raiſe a new Perſecution; which ſhews not a Chriſtian Spirit or Charity in him or his Abettors, Apoſtates from us, or others, whoſe Help (by divers of of his ſilly dirty Stories) he appears to have had.

A Ca-

A Catalogue of ſome of the great Miſtakes, Abuſes and Calumnies, in the Book ſtiled, The Snake in the Graſs; *with brief Reflections thereupon.*

Snake, p. 93, 94. THat G. Fox's *chief Principle was at firſt to direct Men to the inward Anointing, and that they needed no Man to teach them, but as the Anointing teacheth them, and that God is come to Teach his People himſelf; but that he would not truſt to this, for that he went about Teaching outwardly, and has erected an outward Church-Diſcipline and Authority to over-rule the Anointing,* &c.

They keep up outward Miniſtry and Preaching, which are more inconſiſtant with their Principle of reducing all to the Inward, and waiting for the Lord in ſilence within.

Reflection. Here are 3 Falſhoods contained in this Calumnious Charge. As 1. That *G. F.* would not truſt to this Anointing. 2. Church-Diſcipline to over-rule the ſame.

3 Keep-

3. Keeping up an outward Miniſtry and Preaching as inconſiſtant therewith. Theſe are both falſe and apparent Perverſions, reflecting alſo upon the Holy Apoſtles and their Miniſtry, preaching and writing Epiſtles and Inſtructions to the Churches, relating to both Church Order and Diſcipline, and yet directed and referred them to the ſame Divine Unction (received from the Holy One) the Holy Spirit, the Word of Faith and Grace of God within them. Therefore Miniſtry and Inſtructions to good Order and Diſcipline, were not to over-rule the inward Anointing, but (as proceeding from the ſame) to help ſtrengthen and confirm them in it; for if the Doctrin of the Church of *England* be ſo much for the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, the Light within, *&c.* as he confeſſed, what then is their Miniſtry and Diſcipline to over-rule the ſame? How will he reconcile himſelf to his condemning us in this Caſe?

Sn. *p.* 95, 96. *Theſe two Madmen,* Fox *and* Muggleton, *both their Inſpirations came from the ſame Author, the Father of Lies, who in that Hurricane of Schiſm and Rebellion, got an Act of Parliament for Tolleration and Liberty of Conſcience to ſow his Tares at Noonday.*

Ref. The firſt part is a groſs Calumny againſt *G. F.* whoſe divine Inſpiration and ſound

found Teſtimony, given him of God, was evident againſt *Muggleton*'s dark Spirit, preſumptuous and blaſphemious Doctrine. 2. The latter part is a bold Calumny and Reflection upon the Parliament, and *Act* thereof, for Tolleration and Liberty of Conſcience, as if the Devil, the Father of Lies, did influence the Parliament to make the ſaid *Act*, which is a moſt preſumptuous and audacious Aſperſion. We know no other *Act* of Parliament obtained for Tolleration and Liberty of Conſcience, but the Act of *Exemption*, made in the Firſt Year of King *William* and Queen *Mary*; and which was made for no ſuch end, as for the Devil to ſow his Tares, but for the Eaſe and Liberty of tender Conſciences, from the Devil's envious Work of Perſecution, God having ſo order'd it, that the Seed of Chriſt's Kingdom, his *Word and Goſpel*, may have Liberty, and be ſown the more plentifully: But it appears our preſent Liberty is greatly envied, by this perſecuting Author, and ſuch ſcandalous Libellers.

Sn. *p.* 104. *That one of the Orders given forth by their Yearly Meeting*, 1693. *commands, That none ſhall carry Guns in their Ships.*

Ref. This alſo is untrue: We know no ſuch Commands given forth by our Yearly Meeting, but only a tender Caution to ſuch that have acted contrary to their former Prin-

Principle and Practice, to the injuring of their own Souls, and endangering their own and other Lives, *&c.*

As touching ſome Ship-maſters, eſteemed Quakers, carrying Guns in their Ships mentioned in the ſaid Meeting, 1693. our Chriſtian Principle and Innocency is cleared, in the Epiſtle, in theſe Words, *viz.*

Dear Friends,

'YOU very well know our Chriſtian 'Principle and Profeſſion in this Mat-'ter, both with reſpect to God and *Ceſar*, 'and that becauſe we are Subjects of Chriſt's 'Kingdom, which is not of this World, 'we cannot Fight, *John* 18. 36. yet being 'Subjects of *Ceſar*'s Kingdom, we pay our 'Taxes, Tribute, *&c.* according to the 'Example of Chriſt and his Holy Apoſtles 'relating to Chriſt's Kingdom and *Ceſar*'s, 'wherein we are careful not to offend, *Mat.* '17. 27. & 22. 20, *Rom.* 13. 6, 7. being alſo 'very glad and much ſatisfied in the many 'Teſtimonies given at the Meeting of our 'Friend's Innocency, quiet and peaceable 'Behaviour, under the outward Govern-'ment, as becomes our Chriſtian Principle 'and Profeſſion.

Sn. *p.* 115. *Whatever a Quaker dictates, if it were to depoſe the King and ſet up their Univerſal*

verſal Monarch, and to aſſert, by Arms, their own Heirſhip to the uttermoſt parts of the Earth, if they ſhould abrogate any or all of our Laws, or any thing elſe whatever their Arbitrary Enthuſiaſtical Spirit ſhall ſuggeſt to them, this muſt not be looked upon as any thing that is human, but as the very Words of God, &c.

Ref. Theſe are very bitter, invidious and calumnious Suggeſtions, and cruel Jealouſies of a high Nature, as if this poor Libeller eagerly thirſted after our Blood: But the Matters thus ſuggeſted are ſo groſs, that we need ſay little to them, but commit our innocent Cauſe to him that judgeth righteouſly, and bleſs his Name we converſe with no ſuch Spirit as would ſuggeſt or excite to any ſuch pernicious, wicked hurtful or treaſonable Things or Actions as here ſuggeſted againſt us, as our peaceable Converſation, ever ſince we were a People, hath demonſtrated.

Sn. p. 122. *That in the Anſwer to* F. Bugg's *Impeachment, they* (i. e. *the Quakers*) *would perſuade us, That all they have ſaid againſt the Payment of Tithes, was* only *meant by them to the Popiſh Clergy, but by no means againſt the Right of the Church of* England *to their Tythes*, &c.

Ref. This is partially and wrongfully ſtated. Our Anſwer to *F. Bugg* plainly ſhews our conſcientious Diſſatisfaction with

Tithes in general, and the forcing thereof now in this Gospel-day by any Clergy whatsoever, as not consistent with the practice of Christ's Ministers or Testimony of divers Martyrs, who not only testified against the Popish Clergy forcing the Payment of Tithes, but also against Tithes (and Temporalities) themselves, and against the secular Powers imposing or forcing them, Tithes being abolished under the New Covenant and by Christ's new Law. See *William Thorp*'s Discourse, at large, on this Subject, 1 vol. of Martyrs, fol. 700, 708. in King *Henry* IV. his Reign, Old Impression.

Sn. p. 133. *Their Principles destructive to all Government*, &c.

Ref. This is a general, very gross and invidious Aspersion. Our Principles are Christian and peaceable, and our Conversation among Men and toward the Civil Government, is and hath been a manifest Indication thereof, as well as our publick and frequent Testimonies and Prayers to Almighty God for Rulers and People; and when any of us have testified against the abuse of Government and corruption of Governors, and against them for the same, this could not be destructive of any just or good Government.

Sn.

Sa. Highly asserting Tithe, or the Tenth part to be of *divine Right*, viz. *As God's Tribute, God's Tithe due to the Evangelical Priesthood, to that Order of Priesthood after the Order of* Melchisedeck, *as a Tribute to God, a part of God's Worship peculiar to God, Tithes of God, and to confirm his* Jure Divino *Claim of Tithes*, p. 175, 176. *That several Kings of* England, *who had then the sole Right and Property in all the Lands of* England, *have anew dedicated by particular Vows, as* Jacob, (Gen. 28. 22.) *all the whole Tithes of the Lands of* England *to God; and signed Charters and Grants of the same tendered upon their Knees at the Altar of God, in presence, and with the approbation of the Lords and Estates of the Land, with heavy Curses and Imprecations upon themselves, or any of their Successors, who should recal the same or incroach in any part upon the said Tithe of God, and upon all who should receive such Grants from them or assist them in such Sacriledge, and the same have been confirmed by several Acts of Parliament.*

And he further adds, *That to maintain the* Sacrilegious Impropriations *which the Pope had made of the Secular Clergy to indow their Monasteries, which* Henry VIII. *instead of restoring, did yet more sacrilegiously impropriate to the Laity*, p. 164, 165, 169, 170, 171, 173, 175, 176, 177, to p. 189.

Ref. Pray obſerve the nature and import of theſe Paſſages, as they are thus truly collected; how like a dutiful Son of the Mother Church (as that of *Rome* is called) this Man looks? How ſtrenuouſly he argues for the divine Right of Tithes, and how he would renew the ſenſe of the heavy Curſes of Popiſh Kings denounced upon themſelves or any of their Succeſſors, who ſhould either recal the ſame or *incroach*, in any part, upon the Tithes, and upon all Aſſiſters in ſuch Sacriledge (as he calls it?) But it ſeems King *Henry* VIII. would not be bound by any of the ſaid Curſes, no more than by the Pope's Supremacy. I think the Man has out-done the *Rhemiſts* and other Jeſuits and Popiſh Prieſts in theſe Aggravations, to faſten the ſaid Curſes not only on *Henry* VIII. but upon all the Impropriators and Receivers of ſuch Grants, as aforeſaid; though the *Rhemiſts* and he agree as to Tithes, being *Jure Divino*, as in their Annotations on *Heb.* 7. They ſay, "That the Payment of Tithes is "a natural Duty that Men owe to God in "all Laws, and to be given to his Prieſts, "in his behalf, for their Honour and Live-"lihood; and that *Jacob* promiſed or vow-"ed to pay them, *Gen.* 28. And that "*Abraham* ſpecially giving them to *Mel-*"*chiſedeck*, plainly thereby approveth "them, or their equivalent to be due to

Chriſt,

" Chriſt and the Prieſthood of the New " Teſtament, much more than either in " the Law of *Moſes* or in the Law of Na- " ture, and for Tithes due to the Clergy " of Chriſt's Church, *&c.*

See now how exactly this Churchman and theſe *Rhemiſts* agree in this point of Tithe. But that the Reformed Proteſtants, and diverſ eminent Proteſtant Martyrs, were of the contrary Judgment concerning Tithes; hear *Firſt*, what Dr. *Fulk* ſaith in Anſwer and Oppoſition to the *Rhemiſt* recited Annotation on *Heb* 7. *viz.* " The Payment of " Tithes as it was a Ceremonial Duty is " abrogated, with other Ceremonies, by " the Death of Chriſt; but as it is a neceſ- " ſary Maintenance and Livelihood to them " that ſerve in the Church, it may be re- " tained, or any other Stipend appointed " that may be ſufficient for their Main- " tenance, be it *more* of *leſs* than the *Tenth* " part. But that there is any ſacrificing " Prieſthood to whom it is due in the New " Teſtament, the old Payment of Tithes " doth not prove; neither did Chriſt him- " ſelf, our High-Prieſt, ever make claim " unto them; nor his Apoſtles the Miniſters " of the Church; but only a ſufficient Liv- " ing by the Goſpel, to be allowed of their " temporal Goods, to whom they miniſtred " ſpiritual Goods, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. *Gal.* 6. 6.

From all which 'tis evident, *First*, That the Proteſtants in thoſe Days did not eſteem Tithes of divine Right for Goſpel Miniſters, but abrogated by the Death of Chriſt, but indefinitely allowed a ſufficient Maintenance for them, without reſtricting it to the Tenth.

Secondly, Divers eminent Martyrs and others, who were both Perſons of Piety and good Fame, are more full and plain in this Point againſt Tithes in the Goſpel-day and times; as *John Wickliff*, *William Swinderby*, *Walter Brute*, *William Thorp*, the *Bohemians*, with other Chriſtians mentioned in the Book of Martyrs, did bear Teſtimony againſt Tithes and compell'd Maintenance by the civil Authority. This of their oppoſing Tithes was made a principal Article againſt them by the Popiſh Biſhops and Clergy; as more largely and particularly appears in the 1ſt vol. of Martyrs, in the Reigns of *Richard* II. *Henry* IV. and *Henry* V.

And tho' with thoſe Chriſtian Martyrs and firſt reformed Proteſtants, we are perſuaded, That Jeſus Chriſt by his Suffering and Death hath abrogated Tithes, and the Law that required them according to *Heb.* 7. and that his Miniſtry ought to be free and without any forced Maintenance, yet 'tis not our Buſineſs now ſtrictly to diſpute the

Merits

Merits of that Case of Tithes, being fully opened by other Hands; as *Fra. Howgill* in his *Great Case of Tithes*, and *Tho. Ellwood* in his *Foundation of Tithes shaken*, and *R. Richardson*'s Testimony against Tithing among Christians; (with divers others) to which we refer the Reader.

And to shew how much this Adversary resembles a Son of the old pretended Mother Church; in his Contempt and Scorn against some of the Protestant Reformers, particularly against *William Thorp*, p. 169. for esteeming their Priests (or Gospel Ministers) *not to come of the Lineage of* Levi, *but of* Judah; which can intend no other, but as they come of Christ who came of the Tribe of *Judah*, and not of *Levi*; for this *William Thorp* is derided, as *shewing what a doughty Clerk he was*: And with *Fulsom Stuff*, p. 170. our Adversaries saying, *Who told* Thorp, *or the Quakers, that our Priests came of the Lineage of* Judah? *Are they Jews? What fulsom Stuff is this?* (quoth he). No doubt *William Thorp* meant the true Priesthood of Christ descended spiritually of his Line, and not naturally; And does not *Jo. Fox* call him *A valiant Warrier under the triumphant Banner of Christ*; and commend him, as that *the Might, Spirit and Grace of God, to a marvel, appeared in him.* But this Popish Agent, ironically renders him a *doughty*

Clerk, a fulſom Writer. What fulſom, popiſh Stuff is this?

Sn. p. 194. *Traiterous Principles and Actions* charged againſt the Quakers from 1650, to 1660. *as alſo Blaſphemies and Treaſons, Blaſphemers and Traitors*, p. 196, 197, 198.

Ref. We need but anſwer theſe with Negation and Deteſtation, as being moſt foul Raileries proceeding from a Spirit of Perſecution and deadly Malice, which the righteous Lord will rebuke; but has he not heard of ſome of the Clergy, who have lately abſolved Perſons condemned of High Treaſon? His quoting *Bugg*'s Authority for theſe black Charges, *p.* 199. ſhews his partial Credulity in not taking notice of our Anſwers to him. As alſo our Anſwer to *John Penmyman* on the like Paſſages, Entituled, *Chriſt's Lambs defended from Satan's Rage.*

Sn. p. 199. He chargeth *G. Fox* and *E. Burrough*, with *Traiterous abetting of* Oliver *and the* Rump.

Ref. This is very harſh and deny'd.

He forgets how the then Clergy abetted *Oliver*, and highly applauded him and his Son *Richard*, as their *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, and ſhews as little regard to the Act of Indemnity in theſe Recriminations, if they were true.

Sn.

Sn. Yet in *p.* 204, 205, 206, 207. 208. he not only gives a Recital of a cruel and bitter Petition and Charge againſt divers of the People called Quakers, directed To the Right Honourable the Council of State, as they were called by ſeveral of the Prieſts and others in *Lancaſhire*, and printed in 1653. but alſo takes it for granted that the Perſons charged, *were guilty of every part of the Charge*, p. 209.

Obſerve. Thus he has ſided with the Perſecutors of thoſe Times, who abetted and ſheltered under that Government, which no doubt he now eſteems not Loyal; and not only ſo, but he appears very partial and credulous of their moſt bitter and malicious Charges, which were then deſigned to ſtir up ſevere Perſecution.

Sn. One of the Charges, *p.* 202, 203, 205, 206. *That* G. Fox *profeſſed and avowed, That he was equal with God.* Another, *That he profeſſed himſelf to be the Eternal Judge of the World.*

Ref. Obſerve here the Man's partial Credulity and Injuſtice again, in taking for granted what perſecuting Adverſaries have long ſince unjuſtly ſuggeſted againſt a conſcientious Sufferer, without hearing his Defence; where the ſaid *G. F.* being charged by his Perſecutors with *profeſſing himſelf to be equal with God*, poſitively denies the Charge

Charge as not so spoken, as that *G. F.* was *equal with God*; but confessed, That the Father and the Son are one; and that *Christ and the Holy Spirit are equal with God*; *Saul's Errand*, p. 5, 6. And so to Christ Jesus, both as he was of the Seed of *Abraham*, and also as he was equal and one with the Father: And do not these confess both the Humanity and Divinity of Jesus Christ? Vid. *Just Inquiry*, p. 12.

Sn. p. 212. *That the Quakers take the Name of God and Christ to themselves, because of God's supposed dwelling in them.* And p. 213. *Their pretense to Perfection, equal even to the Perfection of God himself, and that they all pretend to it.*

Ref. We the Quakers (so called) positively deny all such presumption and these Charges thereof in their several Parts: Pray when and where did ever the People, called Quakers, call themselves by those Names of *God and Christ*, either because of God's Indwelling or for any other cause? We deny the Charge as both blasphemous and confused: God's indwelling in his People cannot render them God. And though we do sincerely believe and own a perfection of a deliverance from Sin, and of Sanctification and Holiness, as obtained and wrought by Jesus Christ, for and in true Believers in this Life, yet we cannot pretend

to

to any ſuch equality of Perfection as that of God himſelf, which in Wiſdom and Power, *&c.* is infinite; ſeeing we are Men, and not God; finite Creatures, and not the Creator. Therefore 'tis a great and groſs Lie to ſay of the Quakers, *They all pretend to ſuch Perfection and Equality.*

As it was alſo likewiſe anſwered in the ſaid *Juſt Inquiry into the Libeller's Abuſe*, as followeth, *p.* 12. " It's therefore a groſs " Slander implied againſt the Quakers, that " 'tis their Boaſting, Doctrin or Principle, " that they, or any of them, are equal " with God, becauſe they partake of his " Spirit that raiſed Jeſus from the Dead " (and of the divine Nature and Image) " they pretend to no ſuch Equality or Prin- " ciple, neither doth *G. F.* but the con- " trary he denies it of *himſelf, or any other* " *Creature, as that any Creature ſhould be* " *equal with the Creator*; as in his *Great* " *Myſtery*, fol. 127. and we abhor any " ſuch Boaſting.

Sn. p. 216, 217. *That moſt of all are they inraged againſt* G. Keith, *for Preaching up the neceſſity of a Chriſt without; and that the Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation, without ſomething elſe; that is, Chriſt Jeſus without us, ſuffering and dying outwardly for us.*

Ref.

Ref. 1. The first part is not true: We are not offended at *G. K.*'s preaching Christ, or his Suffering and Dying without us, truly considered. But 2. at his undervaluing the Light within, *as not sufficient to Salvation*, or not sufficient without something else; seeing *G. K.* confesseth, *That the Light within, in true sense, is God and Christ, the eternal and essential Word*, as in his *Antichrists and Sadducees*, p. 23. Surely Christ within and Christ without, are not two Christ's; Christ without is not another Christ than Christ within, tho' his being without and within are in different manners. By the Light within being *sufficient* to Salvation, or to bring Salvation, we mean *able to save*, as the ingrafted Word is able to save the Soul, yea, even where the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to a little Leaven which leavens the whole, it bespeaks its Vertue and Efficacy, surely then God and Christ, the eternal and essential Word, is all-sufficient and *able* to save Man from Sin, Wrath and Damnation; nevertheless God hath respect to Christ Jesus his Mediation, Suffering and Dying for us, in his so saving us; but that *God and Christ the eternal Word of God within* (who cannot be divided) are absolutely sufficient and able actually to save and deliver Men from Sin and the Wrath to come, (and so do) ought not to be questioned;

we

we being reconciled by the Death of Christ, are saved by his Life. The Light and Life of Christ within cannot be without Christ, no more than the Light of the Sun can be without the Sun, or a Stream without a Fountain; the Light and Life of Christ within us, hath livingly made us Partakers of the Fruit and Benefit of his Suffering, Death and Resurrection without us; and as much has been asserted of the Light within, and sufficiently thereof, by *G. K.* as any of us, in his former Books. How he is shaken and varied in this and some other Points, we may refer to his *Universal Grace* and *Immediate Revelation*, and other Books; as also, to the Remarks made on them, and his latter Books by *Tho. Ellwood*, *John Penington*, and the *Moderate Church-man*.

Sn. p. 218, 219. *That Christ's making an outward attonement and satisfaction for Sin, by an outward shedding of outward Blood, they* (i. e. *the Quakers*) *turn all this to a meer Allegory, tending only to an inward Christ, that is, their Light within, to spiritual Blood shed inwardly in their Hearts.*

Ref. 1. We are injuriously and wrongfully accused in this Charge: We do not turn Christ's outward Suffering, Sacrifice, Blood or Attonement made for Sin thereby, into a meer Allegory, as if there had been no such thing in reality both outwardly

and

and literally; this is far remote from our Intentions, thus to allegorize away all these to the Inward, as if no Christ had outwardly been or suffered for Mankind; 'twas never our Opinion. 2. Yet deny not but it has been, and still is our sincere Belief and Persuasion (as well as our Experience in measure) that all Christ's Sufferings and Sacrifice, his Cross, his Blood and Water shed *without*, had a misterious and allegorical Meaning and interpretation (as well as a literal) in them, who are crucified with him, and really washed from their Sins in his Blood, and there is his spiritual Blood and Water as well as the outward; for all that is spoken of the Blood of Christ in Scripture, is not to be taken only in a literal sense.

Sn. p. 219, 220. *That this inward Christ they make to be the Archi-Type of which that Man Christ Jesus was but the Type, Figure, &c.*

Ref. 'Tis a new Notion imposed upon us, that we make Christ as inward the *Archi-Type*, chief or principal Type, for Christ who is not divided, is the substance and end of all Types and Figures, and therefore 'tis not true in it self, nor of us, That the Man Christ Jesus was but the Type or Figure; for it hath pleased the Father, that all fulness should dwell in him, which Types,

Fi-

Figures and Shadows, are far short of.

Sn, p. 220, 221. *That this Doctrin* (which he charges against the Quakers) *makes no more of Christ Jesus than a good Example; as a Man who had a great measure of the true Christ, and that the Body of that Man Christ Jesus he has now thrown off, and is no more a Man.*

Thus, saith he, *has the Devil in the Quakers, totally destroyed Christ's Humanity, as in the* Socinians *he has taken away his Divinity.*

Ref. Here are five notorious Falshoods contained in this Charge against the Quakers: In opposition to which we say our Belief and Doctrin is, That Christ Jesus was and is more than a good Example, he was also a most acceptable Sacrifice and Saviour, in whom we have Life and Salvation, through Faith in him, his Name and Power. 2. He received the Spirit, not by measure but in fulness, and that he is the true and very Christ of God. 3. That the Man Christ Jesus has not thrown off his own particular Body, for 'tis a most glorious Body. 4. And Christ himself a most glorious heavenly Man in Soul and Body. 5. The Devil is a great Enemy to all faithful Quakers, and hath no place in them, by the Power of Christ they have overcome that

wicked

wicked one, and he cannot destroy Christ's Humanity or Manhood, 'tis blasphemous to affirm it; tho' he persecute the Seed of the Woman and bruise his Heel, this Seed shall bruise his Head, and hath done it, and will destroy the Devil and his Works, from having any Power or Dominion, where Christ, the promised Seed, is truly received and reigns.

Sn. p. 222. *That they make themselves equal to Christ Jesus (yea) to be Christ, preferring of themselves before him*, p. 224.

Ref. These gross Lies and blasphemous Calumnies are utterly denied, being also refuted before: We have abundance of such Stuff reiterated in the windings and turnings of this *Snake in the Grass.*

Sn. p. 239. *That the Quakers will not allow Christ to be the promised Seed, or that he was more a Man in the Body of Jesus, than in the Body of any other Man.*

Ref. These are gross and notorious Falshoods still: We ever believed the promised Messiah, the Christ of God, to be the promised Seed, which by the Power of God should bruise the Serpent's Head; and that he was true and perfect Man in the Body which he took upon him (which was the Body of Jesus who was born of the Virgin *Mary*) as he was and is a quickning Spirit in other Men, especially in true Believers.

Sn.

Sn. p. 239. He confeſſeth *the Influence and Inſpiration of his bleſſed Spirit is the ONLY true ſaving Light within us, but not the Seed; and Chriſt himſelf (as the Quakers blaſphemouſly dream) only a Ray or Communication of his Light and Life to us.* But p. 242. *he ſpeaks of Faith in Chriſt's outward Blood, by which ONLY there is Salvation.*

Ref. If the only true ſaving Light within us, be the Inſpiration of the bleſſed Spirit and Communication of the Light and Life of Chriſt to us as is granted, tho' this as within be not Chriſt in his fulneſs as in himſelf, yet 'tis as truly the Incorruptible Seed the Word, Chriſt our Life and Light; as the Life of Chriſt is Chriſt, or as the Spirit of the Lord is the Lord; as where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; now the Lord is that Spirit: It is Chriſt gives us both Life, Light and Spirit, and Chriſt is our Life, Light and Salvation. But do not the Words *only Salvation by Chriſt's outward Blood*, exclude any other means of Salvation? And then how is his Spirit the only true ſaving Light within us? Tho' that Blood of Chriſt be of true value and eſteem, as part of his Sacrifice and Price, it is his Spirit and Power which quickens and actually ſaves the Soul from Sin and Death.

Sn. p. 245. He accuſeth the Quakers with *denying any other God or Chriſt but themſelves.*

Ref. This is one of his moſt horrid and blaſphemous Slanders, and ſolemnly by us denied with as utter deteſtation and abhorrence, as any of the reſt of his moſt groſs and abſurd Calumnies.

Sn. p. 251. *That they expreſly diſown any other Chriſt than what is within them; and that the Quakers do not believe that Chriſt has any other Body, or other Humanity, than that ſpiritual or allegorical Body which, they ſay, he has within them.*

Ref. 1. To the firſt part: We own not two Chriſt's; the true Chriſt is but one Chriſt, and we own him, as he is both without us and within us; tho' he is not wholly contained within us, yet he's truly within us by his Spirit, Light and Life, and dwelling in our Hearts, by Faith. What other Chriſt does this Man own, than him who is in true Believers? 2. The latter part of his Charge is not true: We believe Chriſt has his ſpiritual glorious Body without us, like unto which we alſo believe our low Body ſhall be changed and faſhioned.

Sn. p. 254. *That the Quakers, by a monſtrous ſort of Tranſubſtantiation, think themſelves to be the Chriſt.*

Ref. This is a monſtrous Falſhood and Forgery ſtill to defame and odifie us, grounded on divers other falſe and partial Stories, and is before, in ſubſtance, anſwered.

Sn.

Sn. p. 255. *That* G. Keith, *for his most Christian Doctrin of a Christ without, was condemned by their last Yearly Meeting.*

Re. This is a notoriously false Story again, as the two Accounts given of him, by two Yearly Meetings, may evince, having no such cause assigned in them, for our conditionally disowning him, but his unchristian Spirit and Behaviour, as an Instrument of divisions and disturbance in the Churches of Christ, whereby he hath cut himself off, unless he repent.

Sn. p. 262. *Their spiriting away the Letter of the promised Seed, the Humanity of Christ,* &c.

Re. This Charge, with all the hard Consequences depending thereupon against us, are sincerely and utterly denied by us: As by the *Letter* of the promised Seed, he means the Scripture-History of the Man Christ; where proves he that we spirit this *away?* Our owning Christ in Spirit and as a quickning Spirit in us, was never intended, as we know, to deny his real Manhood, Mediation or Intercession without us, no more than the Apostle did. See 1 *Cor.* 15. 45, 47. where the second Man, the Lord from Heaven, is also called a *quickening Spirit.*

Sn. p. 263. He charges them with *running into this Excess, of throwing off the Humanity of Christ, abusing the Scriptures by the contemptible*

temptible Names of Beaſtly Ware, Duſt, Death, &c. and calling the Holy Scriptures by the contemptible Names of Duſt and Beaſtly Ware, p. 267.

Re. Theſe are ſtill old repeated, ſhameful Calumnies againſt us. The firſt part is ſufficiently anſwer'd before, and in many other Books, for our ſincerely and plainly owning the bleſſed and moſt-glorious Man, Chriſt Jeſus, according to plain Scripture. The latter part is ſome of *F. Bugg*'s calumnious Abuſes and Perverſions, and clearly detected and refuted, in ſeveral Anſwers to his ſcurrilous Pamphlets; and his Authority will go but a little way, what Credit ſoever 'tis of with this obſcure Adverſary. 'Tis far remote from us to own any ſuch contemptible Names, as to call the Holy Scriptures *Beaſtly Ware*, &c. Tho', perhaps, making a Trade upon Scripture, or Preaching for Hire or Mony, hath been ſo called by ſome or other.

Sn. p. 268. *That it is plain they never gave the Scriptures a good Word, but meerly for popularity, when forced to it.*

Re. He is a very unrighteous and falſe Judge in this alſo; both our Conſciences in the ſight of God, and many of our Writings alſo, teſtifie the contrary; that freely and without force, for the ſake of that divine Inſpiration from whence the Holy Scriptures

ptures proceeded; and thoſe bleſſed and holy Doctrins and Truths, contained in them, they are highly owned and eſteemed by us.

Sn. p. 285. *Judge whether theſe be ſound principled Men, that can turn, conform and transform to every change according to the Times, whether theſe be fit Men to teach People?*

Re. Theſe are ſtill deceitful and envious Suggeſtions: Our manifold Sufferings in our Perſons and Eſtates, for Conſcience-ſake, by Perſecutions (many whereof being the Temporizers of the Clergy) do manifeſt the contrary to what's here ſuggeſted againſt us, that we have not turned, changed nor conformed according to the Times, in point of Worſhip, Principle, Faith or Diſcipline; for could we have ſo done, we might have eſcaped many deep Sufferings and great Loſſes which we have undergone, and then have been owned by ſuch temporizing and perſecuting Prieſts as now reproach us, when they cannot otherwiſe perſecute us as formerly.

Sn. p. 314. *The Lord help them, and hear our Prayers for them, ſince they will not pray for themſelves,* &c.

Re. We have no reaſon to believe that this Perſon can pray ſincerely for us, ſeeing he is ſo full of Wrath and Envy that he notoriouſly

riouſly belies us in his Prayer, in ſaying, That *they* (*i. e.* the Quakers) *will not pray for themſelves.* He ſeemingly prays, but rails and reviles as it were with one Breath, both next before and after his Prayer.

Sn. p. 319. *That thus the Quakers ſay, That he (Chriſt) dwelt only in the Body of that Man Jeſus, as in a Vail, but took not that Body into his own Perſon, ſo as to become Hypoſtatically united to it.*

Re. We are to ſeek herein, as not knowing where the Quakers ſay theſe things of Chriſt and his Body (which he took and dwelt in) as if he took it not into his own Perſon, ſo as to be really or ſubſtantially united to it; we never underſtood that it did not properly belong to himſelf, but to ſome other Perſon. The Objection herein againſt us is not only ſome Perverſion, but frivilous and impertinent: Tho' his *Fleſh* is called the *Vail*, yet 'twas that he owned as his own Body, being alſo called the *Body of Jeſus*, which was not a fantaſtical but a real Body; and he who is the entire Chriſt, the Man Jeſus, is not divided in Body or Spirit. Nevertheleſs Chriſt the eternal Son of God was (as to his divine Nature and ſpiritual Being) as the ſpiritual Rock, before he took on him that Body that was prepared for him.

Sn.

Sn. p. 320. *That the Quakers moſt expreſly make Chriſt's outward Blood the Type and Figure of inward Blood, ſhed ſpiritually in their Hearts.*

Re. We know not what Author he has for this Charge. However, the Quakers really own Chriſt's outward Blood as a part of his precious and acceptable Sacrifice; and we deny not but that Blood of his, as well as the Water that came out of his Side with it, had an allegorical and miſterious ſignification (as well as an outward and literal) even of the ſpiritual Blood and Water of Life, which Chriſt, our High Prieſt, ſprinkleth, and really waſheth our Hearts and Conſciences withal; which we hope no ſenſible Soul will ſay is an outward or literal Sprinkling or Waſhing, but an *Inward and Spiritual.*

Sn. ibid. *That the Quakers make Chriſt without but the Hiſtory, and the Light within the Miſtery or Subſtance, which the Chriſt without, as a Hiſtory or Shadow of it, only pointed.*

Re. The Quakers do not ſo make Chriſt; they make him no otherwiſe than the Father has appointed and made him to be. He is more than either the Hiſtory or Shadow of the Light within; he, as in himſelf, is the ſubſtance of all Shadows, and fulneſs of Light and Life, from whom we have re-

ceived both Spirit, Light and Life. Pray how proves he that the Quakers call Chriſt without, but the *Hiſtory* or *Shadow* of the Light within? We want *proof of this Point.*

Sn. p. 321. *That this the Quakers have done,* viz. *ſet up other Scriptures againſt thoſe received by the Church, beyond any that ever went before them.*

Re. We poſitively deny this Charge. What other Scripture have they ſo ſet up againſt thoſe? Let's have plain Proof, for we are wholly ignorant of any ſuch thing.

Sn. p. 322. *That none ever have ſo contemned and vilified the* Holy Scriptures, *as they have done.*

Re. This is ſtill maliciouſly to reproach and odifie us, with the ſame old, reiterated Calumny. We know none that eſteem and own the Holy Scriptures more than we, both in Faith and Practice, by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, from whence they came.

Sn. p. 323. *That a Man bringing a Bible into the Quaker's Meeting-Houſe in* Grace-Church-ſtreet, *and reading part of a Chapter, the 14th of St.* Luke; *it being the* Bible *ſo moved their Indignation, that one of the chief of them ſnatched the Bible out of his Hand, and thruſt him along the Gallery down ſeveral Steps.*

Re.

Re. We know no ſuch Indignation or Action ſhewn, by any of us, againſt the Bible, nor againſt any Perſon becauſe thereof, neither do we believe it; let the Author prove it if he can. We diſown any ſuch Indignation, either againſt the Bible or any Perſon, meerly becauſe thereof: Poſſibly ſome publick Diſturber might, by ſome or other preſent, be gently turned out of Doors; not becauſe of the Bible, but becauſe of ſome offenſive, turbulent Behaviour.

Sn. p. 325. *That upon pretence of the Light within, the Devil, the grand Deceiver, drew them away from reading of the Scriptures,* &c. *diſcovers their preference of their own Writings to the Holy Striptures.*

Re. We deny both theſe, as utterly falſe, ſcandalous and relative to many more Lies of the ſame kind in this Point.

Sn. p. 327, 328. *That they give all the threatning Diſcouragements that can be, to deter any from reading of them.*

Re. This is as groſs and notorious a Falſhood as the reſt.

Sn. p. 330. *I can* (ſaith the Oppoſer) *name thoſe that now ſtand high among them, who did, before many Witneſſes of the principal Quakers, not ſtick to ſay, That* Paul *was dark and ignorant, and that they ſaw beyond him.*

Re.

Re. We know none, either High or Low, among us, that ever ſo ſaid of *Paul*; therefore let him produce his many *Witneſſes* to prove who thoſe were that ſo ſaid, that *Paul was dark*, &c. or otherwiſe for ever be aſhamed of ſuch odious Defamations.

Sh. p. 335. *That* Simon Magus *was the Father of the* Quakers, Socinians, *and all the reſt of the Anti-trinitarian Heretitks.*

Re. A groſs Calumny againſt the Quakers, rendring them a Sorcerer's Children. But they deny both *Simon Magus* and all Sorcerers, and the Devil the Father of Lies, and all ſuch as would perſuade People to buy the Gift of God (the Goſpel) for Mony. The Quakers are as oppoſite to ſuch Simony, as Light is to Darkneſs.

Sh. p. 338. *That* E. Burrough, pag. 47. *determines clearly, That the Scriptures are not now of any Authority at all to us at this Day.*

Re. He perverts *E. B.*'s Words: We find not ſuch a determination of his; but where he ſpeaks of *that not being a Command from God to me, which he commands to another*; he intends this of ſpecial Commands that were to ſome, as to *Baptize* and *Preach the Goſpel*, as he immediately explains it, and not of general Commands of Duty incumbent upon all, nor againſt the Authority of the Scriptures; it being the Holy Spirit that makes

makes them authoritative and binding, and enables Men to live accordingly who are led by the ſame Spirit.

Sn. p. 342. *That* G. Whitehead *in his ſerious Apology*, p. 49. *prefers not only their Writings, but their* Ex tempore *Preachments, and even all whatſoever they ſpeak*, upon any Account, *to the Holy Scriptures themſelves.*

Re. He very perverſly wrongs *G. Whitehead* in all theſe Expreſſions; for there's not a word of preferring our Writings to the Holy Scriptures, much leſs of all whatſoever we ſpeak thereto; but a preferring the Holy Spirit and its immediate Teaching in Man to the Letter of Scripture, and preaching in the true ſenſe of the Spirit with divine Authority (according as Chriſt did) to the bare reading the Letter as the *Phariſees* did; which was not at all to leſſen the Authority of Holy Scripture.

Sn. p. 343. *To prove groſs Contempt of Scripture daily found among them* (i. e. *the Quakers*) *he gives us another particular Inſtance of a Quaker-Servant that took the Bible, and in the open Day publickly burnt it againſt the Church in* Bread-ſtreet, *to ſhew her Zeal.*

Re. Upon a late Enquiry we underſtand, That there was ſuch a Servant-Maid, who under ſome Diſcompoſure and Temptation, attempted ſuch an evil and mad Action; but was ſeverely rebuked and teſtified againſt

by

by our Friends who came to underſtand that Attempt or Action, which we utterly abhor, and therefore not juſtly chargeable upon us as a People, any more than all the mad Actions of the People in *Bedlam*, who belong to the Church of *England*. Wherefore the great Envy and Injuſtice of this Defamer is very remarkable in this Paſſage, as 'tis extended againſt the Quakers, to prove *groſs Contempts of Scripture daily found among them*; which is as bad as to ſay, They daily burn their Bibles. Oh ſad and ſordid Stuff!

Sn. p. 346. *I aſſure thee, Reader, that there is no mixture of any perſonal Prejudice in this Undertaking; for I do freely own, that I have a real Kindneſs and good Wiſhes for every one of the Quakers, that I have hitherto been acquainted with, and I never received any ſort of Diſobligation from any of them in my whole Life.*

Re. 1. We have no reaſon to believe this Perſon has no perſonal Prejudice in this his reproachful Undertaking, being againſt a whole People, where every Perſon of their Society is concerned, and ſhamefully defamed by him, under as groſs Terms and Characters as the Devil and Malice could invent, and produce, through a poor diſſembling Hypocrite, as thus pretends ſuch real Kindneſs and good Wiſhes for every one the Quakers of his Acquaintance, while at the

the ſame time he's endeavouring to murther their Reputations, both as Men and Chriſtians. 2. And yet he has received no ſort of Wrong from any of them, to diſoblige him, in his whole Life: More ſhame for him then, thus ſordidly to abuſe the whole People as he hath done.

Sn. p. 348. *As to the Nature of Chriſt, they can ſubſcribe the whole Creed, and yet not mean one word of it, of a perſonal Chriſt exiſting now in Heaven in his own true human Nature, without all other Men, or that he is now any otherwiſe a Man than as exiſting in his Saints: But that they mean* ALL *they ſay of their own Light within,* ONLY *which they call a ſpiritual Chriſt, and ſhedding ſpiritual Blood, &c. within them.*

Re. Here are ſeveral Things very perverſly and falſly inſinuated in theſe Paſſages. 1. As if we did not believe the Man Chriſt Jeſus to be now in Heaven without us (as well as ſpiritually within us) which is not true. 2. As if we did not own Chriſt Jeſus to be intire and perfect Man in himſelf, or in his own proper *Being* or *Exiſtence* without us, as well as he is by his Spirit in us) which alſo is not true, for we really own him in both. And though Chriſt, being the ſpiritual Rock, and as he is the Word of God, the immortal Seed and a quickning Spirit, he is *in us*, and livingly felt and known

known in all true Believers, yet not to leſſen his intire Exiſtence, or limit him the *Holy One*, as if he were no where or otherwiſe in *Being* than within us. Such limitation we diſown, as well as wholly to exclude Chriſt out of his Saints, as ſome have done under thoſe unſcriptural Expreſſions of a *perſonal Chriſt exiſting in Heaven, wholly without us*, which Terms ſome of us have queſtioned chiefly becauſe impoſed by ſome to oppoſe the Light, Life and Spirit of Chriſt within, whereby we can only truly know the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to our eternal Salvation and Peace. 3. That Chriſt is truly ſpiritual and glorious, we confeſs and ſhall never deny; and that he has ſpiritual Blood too, ſpiritual Water, Wine and ſpiritual Drink, to ſanctifie, refreſh and comfort our Souls, we muſt confeſs as that we daily experience; as well as he had natural and outward Blood to offer and ſhed on the Croſs for the ſins of the World.

Sn. p. 350. *That the Quakers general Anſwer to the ſeven Queries of the* 15*th of* May, 1695. *was a Trick and Deceit of theirs, to hide and cover their monſtrous Hereſies.*

Ke. This is a very ſevere and high Charge, (eſpecially from one pretending *real Kindneſs for us*) and as falſe as any of the reſt of his Railery againſt us. But what Proof is offered of theſe monſtrous Hereſies, or covering them? *viz.*

Sn.

Sn. *They tell of Christ born of the Virgin* Mary, *who suffered under* Pontius Pilate, *&c. but they keep off the whole stress of the Queries*, viz. *Whether they believe in such a Christ*, as without them? *And that he is now this day a Man without all other Men? No, not a word of this; this pinches too close: And I think this a full Confession of their Heresie.*

Re. Our Adversary appears very much out here; For suppose we did not answer expresly in all the Terms of the said Queries, being indirect and confusedly stated, seeing we gave a scriptural, intire substantial and comprehensive Answer, (which he is not able to confute): This could not amount to any Confession of *Heresie* on our parts, neither does his *thinking* so prove any such thing. He judges with very dark and evil Thoughts in this Matter. Where did we ever say, That Christ being born of the Virgin *Mary*, and suffering under *Pilate*, were *not without us?* Or, that Christ is *not* a Man, without all other Men, as well as spiritually in them? We are to seek for such a Confession by us, for we know none such; but the contrary, we are bound to believe in Christ intirely in all respects as he is; both as he is within us, and as he is without us; both as he is God, and as he is Man, according to Holy Scripture-Testimony of him; and 'tis not uncharitable or envious

think-

thinking the contrary of us, that can be any valid Argument to convict us to the contrary, or of any Hereſies whatſoever.

Sn. p. 351. *Out of ſome of their* (i. e. the Quakers) *Books*, George Keith *has collected their true and genuine Anſwers to each of the ſaid Queries*, &c. *under this* HOLY *Title*, Groſs Error and Hypocriſie detected, *&c.*

Re. The firſt part is falſe: For *G. K.* did partially and perverſly collect divers Paſſages, which could be no proper nor direct Anſwers to thoſe Queries, nor ſo intended, nor by us adapted to any ſuch Queries; therefore the greater Abuſe in him, to collect and place them for Anſwers thereto. 2. His Title and Charge of *Groſs Error and Hypocriſie*, is blaſphemouſly termed HOLY, for 'tis altogether Unholy, as well as Malicious, and *G. Keith* is accountable to the juſt God for ſcandalizing and defaming us, not only with *Groſs Error*, but *Hypocriſie* too. The firſt intends thoſe Books of ours, quoted by him; in all which there's Matter ſufficient to clear us from his Aſperſions, as *Thomas Ellwood* (and *John Pennington* alſo) have well obſerved, in divers Anſwers to him, together with *G. Keith*'s own former Vindications of us (as a People) and our Principles.

The

The latter (*i. e. Hypocriſie*) we may ſuppoſe muſt intend our Anſwer given to the ſaid 7 Queries; wherein (as in divers other things) *G. K.* hath foully *belied* us, contrary to our own Conſciences, which are clear in the ſight of God from *Hypocriſie* in this Matter, as well as in other things: And ſeeing *G. K.*'s Authority ſeems to be of ſome value with the obſcure Author of *The Snake in the Graſs*, he and his Brethren (of the Church of *England*) may take *G. K.* for their Champion, and ſee what they can make of him, for he ſhews himſelf now no *Quaker*, but more near to them; and where he'll yet center or ſettle, in what Society or Communion, is a great Queſtion. Or rather whether he does not aim at ſetting up for himſelf as Sect-maſter, if he can draw ſome ſort of People to admire him in his Notions and reproaching the Quakers (contrary to his former manifold Vindications of them and their Principles) after above 30 Years Converſation and kind Treatment among them.

The Second Part.

Here follows a Catalogue of ſome of the great Miſtakes, notorious Abuſes and Calumnies, in the Second Part *of the ſaid Book, ſtiled,* **The Snake in the Graſs**; *after the Preface, which is bigger than the Book it ſelf.*

Sn. p. 1. In his Sect. 1. THE *Controverſie with the Quaker-Diſſenters has not been purſued by the Church of* England, *with the like Zeal and Pains as thoſe againſt the* Presbyterians, Independents, *and other Diſſenters, becauſe the* Quakers *were not ſo conſiderable either for their Learning, or for their Influence upon the publick Revolutions, which the others cauſed both in Church and State. But their numbers (whe-*

(whether increaſed by their being ſo neglected) are now really formidable, I mean for the many Souls ſeduced by them; they not only ſwarm over theſe Nations, but they ſtock our Plantations abroad.

Re. Tho' the firſt part of this Complaint carries no ſmall Reflection upon the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, &c. rendring them greatly obnoxious in the Eye of the Government, as not only formidable but dangerous (which is moſt proper for them to anſwer) 'tis not truly ſtated as to the *Quakers*: For the Church of *England*, in the two late King's Reigns, has purſued them with more Zeal and Pains than any other Diſſenters, both to ſtop their Growth and to root them out alſo; tho' not by rationally controverting Matters in difference, but by ſuch extream and ſevere Perſecutions, as hard Impriſonments, Baniſhments, Spoil of Goods, *&c.* as no other People of Diſſenters have ſo generally ſuffered, nor to ſuch a degree, becauſe they did not ſtand in a publick Teſtimony, in the Heat of the Day, as the People called *Quakers* have. So that 'tis not through the ſaid Churches neglect, or want of taking Pains to purſue the *Quakers*, that they are ſo multiplied and increaſed; but rather, as the firſt and chief cauſe of their Increaſe was God's Power and divine Providence.

A ſecondary Cauſe was their great Oppreſſions and Perſecutions, of which *Iſrael*'s Oppreſſion and Increaſe, when in *Egypt*, in ſome ſenſe and degree was figurative, or reſembling (even of the true Churches Sufferings) when the more they were oppreſſed, the more they multiplied and grew.

Sn. p. 4. *I find them,* (ſcoffingly telling of the *Rabbies of the Quakers*) *to inherit the Subtilty, as well as Hereſie, of the* Arians *and* Socinians, *who were the moſt ſubtil and hardeſt to be detected of any of the Chriſtian Hereticks; and the Quakers do defend themſelves with the ſame diſtinctions, and even add to their Arts.*

Re. This Adverſary is very much out, and maliciouſly calumnious in this his charging the Hereſie of the *Arians*, as well as *Socinians*, upon the Miniſters among the Quakers: For what was the Hereſie of *Arius?* Was it not that he held *That the Son of God had his beginning of nothing? That there was a time when he was not; That he had a beginning of Eſſence; That he had this Eſſence of nothing; That the Son of God was of free Will inclined to Virtue and Vice; That he was a Creature, and made neither like unto the Father in Subſtance, neither the true Word of the Father by Nature, neither his true Wiſdom; and that the Word of God was not from Everlaſting,* &c. Theſe Hereſies were charg'd upon

on *Arius* and his Complices, in the *Synodical* Epistle of the Council of *Nice* and Bishop of *Alexandria*, lib. 1. cap. 3. *Socr. Scol.* p. 215, 216. & p. 225 ch. 6.

Now we challenge this obscure Adversary to prove, where ever the *Quakers*, or their Ministers, held these blasphemous and atheistical Notions? Nay, 'tis manifest they hold the quite contrary both to *Arius* and *Socinus*, *for the Divinity of the Son of God, the Eternal Word*, as many of their Writings testifie; and therefore he is a gross Lyar who charges us with them; and highly guilty of Folly and Self-contradiction also, in rendring such mad Folks (as he deems us) so very subtil in Distinctions and Arts.

Sn. p. 5. *Many of them have really gone off from the height of Blasphemy and Madness which was professed among them at their first setting up, in the Year*, 1650. *and so continued till after the Year of the Restoration*, Anno 1660.

Re. We utterly deny this Charge again as a foul Scandal, That many of us professed the height of Blasphemy and Madness, or that any in Society with us have so done. The Man shamefully abuseth the Readers, by imposing such lying, defaming Stories upon them.

Sn. p. 10, 11. *Divers Compariſons made between* L. Muggleton *and the Quakers, as denying all Church-Authority, making a dead Letter of the Holy Scriptures, and reſolving all into their own private Spirit,* &c. *That theſe are Twin-Enthuſiaſts, both born in the Year,* 1650.

Re. His Compariſons herein are unjuſt, and Accuſations falſe. 1. We never owned nor had Society with *Muggleton*, but always bore our Teſtimony againſt his dark, blaſphemous Conceits.

2. The ſpiritual Authority of the true Church, we always own and eſteem.

3. The Holy Scriptures (*i. e.* the Holy Doctrin of the Goſpel) we do not make nor call a dead Letter. We diſtinguiſh between the dead Letter and the living Doctrin; and follow not our private Spirits for the underſtanding thereof, but the Spirit of God, the Inſpiration of the Almighty, which giveth the true underſtanding.

Sn. p. 12. *I deſire, before I go farther, to obviate a Prejudice which ſome Readers may take as a little Railery, I am forced to uſe now and then, which they may think not becoming the Subject in Hand.*

Re. His ſaid Book of Four Shillings Price, has more than a little Railery in't; for 'tis ſtuft with abundance of as ſhameful Railery, Lies and Slanders, as ever we met withal:

But

But who, or what has forced him to be such a Railer? Not the Spirit of Christ, not a Christian Spirit to be sure: If he had apprehended us such mad Men and silly ridiculous Fools, as he has represented us, he should rather pity us, than bend his Wits to rail and scoff at us.

Sn. p. 13. *Intending chiefly to insist upon some of their more material and monstrous Heresies*; (thus against the Quakers.)

Re. This Charge looks big, and seems to make a great Noise; but as 'tis levelled against us in general, 'tis as false as the rest. As concerning the *Government* his Authority is as invalid; which is, he only refers us to the *Quakers Unmask'd*, printed 1691. What great Authority is this? but one of *F. Bugg*'s abusive Pamphlets, which is fully answer'd, and his Abuses detected over and over; which this partial Adversary takes no notice of.

That some of these called Quakers, were at first Common-wealth's Men, or for a Common-wealth, and afterward for a Monarchy, when it pleased God by his overruling Power and Providence to cause such alterations. We see no monstrous Heresie herein, any more than was in *Samuel*. See 1 *Sam.* 8. 5, 6. ch. 10. 1.

That the Quakers are againſt their being concerned in Fighting, and deſtroying Men's Lives; as believing, that 'tis not in Chriſt's mediatory Kingdoms; and yet grant, that Wars and Fighting are a Judgment from God in the Kingdom of this World. What Hereſie or Fallibility is in this, pray?

This is the true ſtate of the Difference, however aggravated and perverted by this Adverſary and his Author.

Sn. Sect. 3. p. 17, 18. Anno 1650 *and* 1654. *Then it was that* Rome *was reaping a plentiful Harveſt, which they had long been ſowing, by ſetting up, in that univerſal Toleration, multitudes of various Sects, on purpoſe to divide, and ſo confound their only ſubſtantial Adverſary the Church of* England. *They dreſſed Enthuſiaſm in ſeveral Shapes and Forms of* Presbyter, Anabaptiſt, Independent, Quaker, Muggleton, *and along*, &c. *which differ only in degrees.*

Re. Here the Snake puts his Sting out againſt all Proteſtant-Diſſenters; and, as greatly envying their Liberties, makes a very ill Conſtruction of their former Toleration: And no doubt their preſent Liberty does as ill pleaſe him. *Iſhmael* like his Hand is againſt every Man, and no ſort of Diſſenters (how conſcientious ſoever) can eſcape his Blow or Puſh: He makes *Rome* the Author, Patron and Planter of them

them all, both *Presbyter*, *Anabaptist*, *Independent*, *Quakers*, &c. how plainly soever they have approved themselves Protestants, averse to Popery, and as Dissenting-Protestants are tolerated; it appears how greatly he envies their Liberties, and is displeased with the Government for granting the same. Oh rare Son of the Church! Will nothing satisfie this Incendiary, but Persecution and Ruin to Dissenting-Protestants? May not such his Work be very grateful to the Popish Interest? What a cordial Friend then does he shew himself to the Protestants?

Sn. p. 19. *This Doctrin of Enthusiasm came chiefly from the Church of* Rome. Labadee, *a Jesuit, set it up in* Holland; *and* Robert Barclay *the Quaker, was tinctured in his younger Years, in the Scotch Convent at* Paris; *and* John Vaughton *was a Roman Catholick, who is now a great Preacher among the Quakers in* London; *and* (he adds in his Errata) William Southby, *a Preacher now among them in* Pensilvania.

Re. These this obscure Accuser brings as Instances to make good the Title of this Third Section, which is, *That the Popish Emissaries first set up Quakerism in* England; which is an old lying Story, and his Instances as impertinent. And 1st, We deny that any Jesuit set it up in *Holland*, and are perswaded many of our Friends there can

testifie

teſtifie the contrary. 2. Whatever the Educations of the ſaid *R. B.* and *J. V.* were in their Youth, as to Religion, they were none of the firſt Promoters of Quakeriſm (as he calls it) in *England*, by many Years. 3. And ſuppoſe the One was tinctured, and the other was a Roman Catholick, this makes for us; that was not ſince they were Quakers, but before they turned Quakers; and then when they did, they turned from Papiſts and Popery in Teſtimony againſt it, and againſt human Traditions and Superſtitions, and for the Holy Spirit's Teaching and Worſhip of God in Spirit and Truth.

Sn. p. 20. *The Quaker-Infallibility was contrived on purpoſe to bring Men back to the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome, *by theſe Steps. Firſt, the Infallibility was placed by* G. Fox *and all the Primitive Quakers, in every ſingle Quaker.*

Re. Theſe are envious and falſe Aſperſions, to render us infamous, obnoxious and offenſive. 1. We poſitively deny any ſuch Contrivance, Deſign or Purpoſe. 2. We deny that *G. F.* and all the Primitive Quakers, place Infallibility in a ſingle Perſon, like Papiſts, or in every ſingle Quaker without diſtinction, but in the Spirit of Truth, which aſſures us in Matters of Faith and Salvation. The Man often ſillily ſcoffs at

the

the Quaker's Infallibility, but does not truly ſtate their Principle in that Caſe.

Sn. p. 38. *in* Sect 5. *They (i. e.* the Quakers) *damn all the World to Hell; all ſince the days of the Apoſtles, but themſelves.*

Re. This is a great Untruth: We damn none to Hell; 'tis Men's own Wickedneſs (in hating the Light) which carries them to Hell. We believe there were many good Men, and ſaved ſince the Apoſtles days.

Sn. p. 40. *They pretend to a Perfection even equal with God.*

Re. We pretend ſo of Chriſt, not of our ſelves: We deſire we may always be kept truly Humble and in true Fear, out of all Boaſting and high Thoughts of our ſelves, that Chriſt may be magnified in us.

Sn. p. 41, 42. *in* Sect. 5. *They give to themſelves, and to one another, the moſt peculiar Titles of Chriſt; as that of* The Branch, and the Star, and the Son of God, *which are attributed to* George Fox, *and which he takes to himſelf*; quoting *New Rome Arraigned*, p. 33, 34. and *The Quakers Unmask'd*, and *New Rome Unmask'd*, referring the Reader to thoſe Books of *F. Bugg*'s, which he has quoted *upon the Margin*, as he ſaith, p. 48.

Re. Theſe are *F. Bugg*'s notorious refuted Lies, which this Adverſary is ſo ſhamefully credulous of: We poſitively deny giving

giving those peculiar Titles of Christ to our selves, or to one another; and *Bugg* has been charged therewith, and cannot prove them. *G. Fox* is not so much as mentioned in that Epistle of *E. Burroughs*, out of which *F. Bugg* takes these Titles, the *Branch*, the *Star*, &c. which are peculiar to Christ.

Sn. p. 51, 53. Sect 6. *That* G. F.*'s Great Mystery*, p. 282. *endeavours to prove*, *That the Quakers are perfect as God, not only in quality, but in equality, from Christ's words*, Be ye perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Re. These are not *G. F.*'s Words of the Quakers that they are so; his Words are here perverted: He refers to Christ's Words and the Apostles, and to that which is of God and from him, and mentions not the Quakers in the place.

Sn. p. 52. Great Mystery, *p.* 248. again quoted, *viz. All* THAT *have the Son and the Holy Ghost, have* THAT *which is equal in Power and Glory with the Father; and this all the Quakers say they have.*

Re. That the Son and Holy Ghost are equal in Power with the Father, and that the same Spirit that raised Jesus from the Dead dwells in the Saints, we see not this to be such a monstrous Heresie. Are not the Son and Holy Ghost of the same Substance with the Father? And have not the Assembly at *West-*

Weſtminſter, confeſſed as much as *G. F.* ſays? Yet the Quakers do not ſay they have the Holy Ghoſt in fulneſs, but in meaſure.

Sn. p. 53, 54, 55. Sect. 7. *Of the Quakers making their Soul of the ſame Perſon and Subſtance with God*; quoting *Great Myſt.* p. 247. & p. 90, 91. & 273. Of Chriſt's dwelling in the Saints; Of that which came out from the Creator; Of the Soul that came out of him, *&c.*

Re. 1. The Caſe herein is both miſ-underſtood and miſ-repreſented againſt the Quakers: They do not ſo make their Souls of the ſame Perſon and Subſtance with God. I know no ſuch Expreſſions uſed by the Quakers.

2. There's a miſ-underſtanding alſo of *G. F.* in the Caſe about his queſtioning, Is not that a part of God which came out from God, and of his Being? as God breathed into Man the Breath of Life, and he (*i. e.* Man) became a living Soul; to which Words *G. F.* expreſly refers. We always underſtood him to intend, That this Breath of Life, which made Man a living Soul, was that divine Breath, or Spirit of Life, which came out from God and of his own Being; for otherwiſe how ſhould Man thereby become a living Soul? Which clearly diſtinguiſheth the Creature Man to be that living Soul, that was ſo made by that Spirit,

Spirit, Breath and Life which proceeded from his Creator, and which ſome term the Soul of the Soul. So that the Soul of Man, abſtractly conſidered, was as truly created as Man himſelf; tho' that divine Inſpiration, or Breath of Life, whereby the Soul had its Being, Life and Immortality, be Increated and of God himſelf; for we ever diſtinguiſhed between the Soul of Man, and that which ſaves it.

Note, That his 2d, 4th, 8th & 9th Sections are not particularly pointed at, being in Subſtance comprehenſively and ſufficiently anſwered in divers Anſwers to the reſt, and in our *Juſt Enquiry*, the ſame things being often repeated in his Book; as about *Carnal Weapons*; *Damning all the World*; *the Soul*; *and Immediate Revelation.*

Sn. p. 69. Sect. 10. *As they place Infallibility in every ſingle Quaker, ſo they confine it not to Matters of Faith, but extend it to all Perſons and Things, to know all Men's Hearts and all Things in the World by their inward Light without, being told by any.*

Re. Here's a great Miſtake in theſe Accuſations. 1. Such a perſonal Infallibility as to know all Perſons, States and Things in the World, we pretend not to; for that were for Man to pretend *Omniſciency*, which is only proper to Almighty God: The Man's egregiouſly out in confounding *Infallibility* with

with *Omniſciency*. The *Infallibility* or *Certainty* own'd by us, originally is in the Spirit and Light of Truth given by Chriſt Jeſus, and not conſiſting in Perſons, their humane or natural Parts; yet we muſt confeſs, to the Glory of God, that the Spirit of Truth, doth infallibly teach and lead them into all Truth, who truly obey it, and gives them certain knowledge in Matters of Faith and Salvation.

Sn. p. 81. *They turn and wind this Infallibility of theirs at ſuch a rate, that no Man can (I am ſure I cannot) know what they mean by it.*

Re. Where's then the Blaſphemy? Here's manifeſt Contradiction to what he hath ſaid before, about extending the *Quaker's Infallibility to all Perſons and Things, and to know all Mens Hearts and all things in the World*, &c. which is to pretend to Omniſciency, which is only proper to God who only is Omniſcient. Silence had better become this occult Adverſary's Ignorance, than to reproach or vilifie us about what he knows not.

Sn p. 83, 84. *The Strength which God has given to our Bodies, is as ſufficient to climb up to the Skies, as the Wiſdom or Light which he has given to our Souls was ſufficient, of it ſelf, to have found out the redemption of loſt Man, by the Incarnation and Satisfaction of Chriſt to God's Juſtice for our Sins; or if found out, to*

have

have paid that Price, and to have accomplished that whole wonderful Oeconomy of our Salvation by our own Abilities; (and then he goes on thus confusedly) *so very insufficient is the Light within us, even tho' followed to the utmost by its own Strength to carry us to Heaven.*

Re. This is to deny any divine Wisdom, Light, Word or Power to be given to our Souls, as if they could live and immortally subsist without the divine *Logos*, or Word in them, which in Scripture is called, The Ingrafted Word which is *able* to save the Soul, and consequently to carry us to Heaven; 'tis therefore great Darkness to oppose the sufficiency of this Light, this Word or Christ within, or to oppose his Incarnation, Sufferings, Satisfaction, or our Redemption obtained by him, as our Mediator, to this his own inward Light, Power and Appearance; for as truly as Christ Jesus, as our blessed Mediator, has obtained eternal Redemption and Salvation for us, so truly doth Christ Jesus, by his Light, Life and Power, make us Partakers of that Redemption and Salvation, and to know the Oeconomy, Law or Rule of his House and Family, as we obey him therein, that we being reconciled by his Death might be saved by his Life. The divine *Logos*, the Light or Spirit of Christ, is as able now to discover what Christ hath done and suffered for

for our Redemption, as it was to ſhew the Prophets his Sufferings, and the Glory that ſhould follow.

Sn. p. 84. *And therefore the Quakers preaching up the ſufficiency of the Light within (as all of them but the Separatiſts do) is not only highly derogatory to the ſatisfaction paid by Chriſt for our Sins, but it is blaſphemous, in aſcribing to* Our Selves *a Power ſufficient to work out our own Salvation.*

Re. There are two groſs Miſtakes in theſe Paſſages. 1. The ſufficiency we aſcribe to Chriſt, his Light and Life within, is not any derogation to his Satisfaction, Attonement or Ranſom given and paid by him (without us) for Sins and Sinners, no more than Chriſt's own exhorting Men *To believe in the Light, that they might become Children of the Light*; or the Apoſtle's, to *a receiving the ingrafted Word which was able to ſave the Souls*, could be derogatory to his bleſſed intention and end in his Suffering and Sacrifice for Mankind; but the contrary, Chriſt by his Light and Life within leads to know and experience the ſame, *i. e.* our effectual Cleanſing and actual Deliverance from Sin and Satan, *&c.* which he has obtained for us and for Mankind, by his Sufferings and Mediation. 2. We never aſcribed to *our ſelves* a Power ſufficient to work out our own Salvation, that's notoriouſly known to

be expreſly contrary to our profeſſed Principle: We aſcribe our ſufficiency to be in Chriſt by his own Power, Grace and Light in us to work out our Salvation, it being by Grace, through Faith in Chriſt, that we are ſaved, not of our ſelves; 'tis the Gift of God, and without him we can do nothing. And this Heavenly Treaſure, though we have it in our earthen Veſſels, the excellency of the Power is of God and not of us.

After his many Scoffs at our Doctrin of *Infallibility*, which he knows not what to make of, he has at length ſtumbl'd upon an Inſtance of thoſe he eſteems will be found to have the beſt Title to it, *p.* 85. where it is written, *Prov.* 16. 10. *A divine Sentence is in the Lips of the King, and his Mouth tranſgreſſeth not in Judgment.* We would ask him, If none are indued with a divine Sentence and unerring Judgment but Kings? Or, if none are Saints and Partakers of the Spirit of Truth or divine Wiſdom, but Kings? What kind of Kings he means that are thus *infallible*, he does not diſtinguiſh; ſure they muſt be juſt and good Kings indued with divine Wiſdom: But are none elſe ſo but Kings? Do not all that truly fear God partake of the ſame Spirit and Wiſdom? Is God any reſpecter of Perſons? What does he think of thoſe *very Elect*, whom Chriſt implies

implies 'tis impoſſible to deceive, *Mat.* 24. 24. Are they fallible or deceivable? Or of them in whoſe Mouths was found no Guile? Or of them who have put *away all Guile, and all Malice, and all Lying, and all Hypocriſie*, &c. 1 *Pet.* 2. 1. Are ſuch led by an infallible Spirit or no? But to proceed, he has ſome very ſcurrilous and abuſive Flings at *G. W.* to prove him not led by an infallible Spirit of diſcerning or true Judgment, *p.* 87. He quotes *G. W.*'s *Charitable Eſſay, in Anſwer to* Fr. Bugg, *p.* 6. his objecting againſt *G. F.* That they (the Quakers) could diſcern who were *Saints*, and who *Apoſtates*, *without ſpeaking ever a Word.* And ſays that *he* (G. W.) *puts it off ingeniouſly thus, That they could diſcern it by their lofty Looks, wanton and ſcornful Eyes, envious and fallen Countenances, and ſo without ſpeaking ever a Word*, p. 87. And then, among divers other Scoffs and Flouts, goes on; *Is not this very hard Fiſhing for Infallibility?* Adding, *Alas! poor* George, *Is the infallible Quaker* **dwindled down** *to a meer Gypſie or paltry Fortune-teller, to nothing but a little Skill in Phyſiognomy? Ah!* George, *what a bleſſed Spirit would'ſt thee have thought Satan, if thee hadſt ſeen him when he was transform'd into an Angel of Light?* p. 88. 89. in Sect. 10.

To all which it may be ſafely anſwer'd, This Scorner's Abuſe and Perverſion is herein very evident; for that we do not place our Infallibility of diſcerning of Spirits, only upon thoſe outward Signs in the Countenances of wicked Men or Women, as their lofty Looks, ſcornful Eyes, envious fallen Countenances; though theſe were in part inſtanced, in Anſwer to the great wonderment made of knowing wicked Hearts when ſilent, to ſhew there are other outward Signs and Tokens to manifeſt them by, than their wicked Words or prophane Talk, and even ſuch Signs as Scripture takes notice of. And ſeeing this Scorner has unjuſtly perverted and minced the Paſſage quoted, *Char. Eſſay*, p. 5, 6. 'tis meet to recite it more fully, for the Quakers having a Spirit given to them, beyond all the Fore-fathers in the Apoſtacy, *&c.* viz. "That the very intent and meaning of "*G. F.*'s Words herein, was not beyond "all the Fore-fathers without exception, "but beyond all in the Apoſtacy. And fur- "ther; and they can diſcern who are "Saints and who are Devils, and who are "Apoſtates, without ſpeaking ever a word; "that is, they that be in the Power and "Life of Truth (as *G. F.* there ſaith) can "ſo diſcern between Saints and Devils; "and that's poſſible, as 'tis for humble

"Men

" Men to diſcern wicked Perſons, even by " their proud and lofty Looks, wanton " and ſcornful Eyes, envious and fallen " Countenances, the ſhew of whoſe Coun- " teannces teſtifiing againſt them: And more " eſpecially by the *Gift of diſcerning of Spi-* " *rits*, given to ſome in the Church of " Chriſt, Apoſtates and wicked Spirits are " diſcernible from Saints; and that a *Spi-* " *rit of Underſtanding and Diſcerning* is given " among us, *&c.* concluding with the " Saints Right of diſcerning by the *Power* " *and Life of Truth*, between Saints and " Devils.

From all which, pray obſerve how plain it is that diſcerning of Spirits, which we aſſert, is principally placed on (and ſprings from) *the Power and Life of Truth* (that is, from Chriſt) and the Gift of diſcerning of Spirits given to ſome Members eſpecially, (and ſtill is continued) in the true Church; and from which *diſcerning*, Satan cannot be hid, however he transform himſelf; altho' proud and lofty Looks, wanton and ſcornful Eyes, envious and fallen Countenances, are rendred in Scripture as outward Signs or Marks of ſuch wicked Hearts, which alſo the Gift and Spirit of diſcerning perceiveth, and gives to ſee many times through ſuch outward *Mediums*. And therefore the *true diſcerning of Spirits*, which we plead for, is

neither dwindled down to a meer *Gypsie* nor *paltry* Fortune-teller, nor to nothing but a *little Jugler's Skill in Physiognomy*, as this scornful Adversary reflects. And to reprehend his Reproach and Blasphemy herein, and shew him that both God, and good Men divinely inspired, have also taken notice of such Signs, Marks and Tokens in wicked Men's Looks and Countenances, as before mentioned, Let him read and consider these places of Scripture, *Gen.* 4. 5, 6. *Psal.* 10. 4. *Isa.* 3. 9, 16. & 2. 11. & 5. 15. *Psal.* 131. 1. *Prov.* 30. 13. & 6. 17. & 21. 4. And he may see that both God Himself, and his Prophets and Servants, took notice of wicked Men's *Countenances, proud and lofty Looks, and wanton Eyes*, &c. and did not therefore deserve to be numbred among *Gypsies and Juglers*. Behold the Levity and Ignorance of this prophane Scoffer *of the Spirit of discerning and Scripture!*

Who further in's scoffing Humour proceeds against *G. W.* notoriously to detect his Infallibility by Signs and Faces, as well as *G. Fox*'s without speaking ever a word (as he pretends.) His Story is about one *Chr. Atkinson*'s *miscarriage at* Norwich, *in the Year*, 1655. *from* Richard Hubberthorn's *writing, That in the wisdom of God we were searching it out, and in his Will waiting for his Counsel.* The Scoffer reflects, *That notwithstanding*

ſtanding all this, neither G. Fox, G. Whitehead, *nor any other of the infallible Gang could find it out, till* Chr. Atkinſon, *prickt with the ſtings of his own Conſcience, did freely and of his own accord confeſs it, and ſign'd a Paper of Condemnation of himſelf for this wicked Fact*, p. 90, 91, 92. Sect. 10.

And what of all this? What can he make of it? That the then Quakers could not find out the Matter of Fact, till upon their ſearching it out and waiting in the Will of God for his Counſel, the Offender was made to confeſs it, from inward Conviction in's own Conſcience? And what's the conſequence? Therefore they were not led by an infallible Spirit; that follows not. That Spirit might lead them to ſearch and examine the Offender, in order to bring him under Judgment and Senſe of his Evil, which they underſtood before, and upon Examination and placing true Judgment upon him, were made inſtrumental to bring him under Judgment and Confeſſion; for ſome diſcovery of his Crime was made before, which occaſioned their farther Enquiry and Care to prevent the reproach thereof from falling upon Truth and our Friends that were innocent. Beſides, *G. W.* was not at *Norwich* when this Miſcarriage hapned and was diſcovered; yet he affirms, that ſometime before, both he and ſome others perceived

that the ſaid *C. Atkinſon*'s Spirit was wrong, and that he did not live in the fear of God, nor in Humility, and that they were burthened concerning him, and did ſeriouſly caution him; but he was too high to receive their Counſel, inſomuch that they were jealous Truth would ſuffer by him ſome way or other, tho' they pretended not to know the Groſsneſs of his Miſcarriage aforehand, nor till ſome diſcovery was made thereof; neither were they (or are we) deſirous to know all private Converſations and Actions of evil Men. We pretend not to know by Revelation, or the infallible Spirit, how many drunken Prieſts are in *England*, &c. nor how many of them have had their Miſſes, and Baſtards by their Maids and others; nor who they all are by Name; but by outward Relation we have had account of a great many ſuch, tho' we charge not all, nor any of the eminent ones, who are more ſober than the reſt. And if this ſcornful Adverſary ſhall therefore conclude that we have not the Spirit of Chriſt (which is infallible) he might as well conclude, no Man has it, becauſe not omniſcient; which were very abſurd and blaſphemous. And then beſure he has excluded himſelf from having that infallible Spirit of Chriſt, and ſo is none of his, and conſequently deſtroyed the credit of all his own Work againſt us; as therein

in having followed his own Spirit (dictated by Satan:) as the falſe and lying Prophets did, and not the Spirit of the Lord God.

To his ſcurrilous Story of *more tender regard ſhewed to ſome young Women who had given a Confeſſion in Writing to* John Bolton, *of their frailty in the Fleſh, as is told in the Spirit of the Hat; but it was huſh'd up becauſe it touched many eminent ones in the Miniſtry, who from Day to Day reſorted unto them*, &c. p. 95, 96. Sect. 10.

This is a ſligh inſinuating way of implicitely ſcandalizing Perſons by ſuch old envious Stories, and all to caſt Dirt not only upon ſome private Perſons, but even upon *many eminent ones of the Miniſtry*, without telling us the Names either of the Men or Women charged. At this rate many honeſt Perſons, who are of good Fame alſo, may be very injuriouſly brought under ſuſpicion of great Enormity and Scandal. But let this Adverſary, who is ſo very credulous of ſuch infamous Stories, come forth and ſhew himſelf, and be more plain and particular in his Charge, as of the Perſons and Matters of Fact charged, together with the ſaid Confeſſion of the Women; and probably he may have a more direct Anſwer: For his ſuſpicious Charge, as it is exhibited by him, appears a very blind Story, which we can

make

make neither Head nor Tail of. And the *Spirit of the Hat* did then prejudicially and blindly bring it forth; which 'tis hoped the Author hath repented of long before this time.

But this Oppoſer ſhould look and examin among his own Brethren, and remember that *the Incontinency of Prieſts* is no new thing; for there is an old penal Statue-Law, 1 *H.* 7. 4. "made againſt Prieſts, Clerks "and religious Men for *Incontinency*, being "duly convicted of *Advoutry*, *Fornication*, "*Inceſt*, or any other fleſhly Incontinency, "to be puniſhed by the Ordinary by Im-"priſonment, according to the quantity and "quality of the Treſpaſs. If this Law be obſolete and not put in Execution, we cannot ſuppoſe 'tis becauſe all the Prieſts are reformed and clear of that Enormity in theſe Days. However, they would not all be charged with the Faults of ſome.

Sn. p. 99. *I hope what has been ſaid will be ſufficient to cure Men of this moſt miſtaken pretence to Infallibility, grounded upon the Infallibility of the Spirit of God, as if nothing could proceed from Infallibility, but what was infallible.*

Re. 1. We know no miſtaken pretence to Infallibility, that's grounded on the Infallibility of the Spirit of God; for 'tis an infallible unerring Spirit in all its Gifts, Teach-

Teachings, Operations and Fruits, and leads the truly ſpiritual-minded into all Truth; and no other Spirit can we ground Infallibility, in Matters of Faith or Duty, upon. 2. As no Lie is of the Truth, ſo nothing proceeds from this Spirit of Truth, but what's true and certain, as all its Ways and Teachings are.

Sn. p. 102. *The Caſe of the Quakers is ſo hard, that if we can prove but* ONE *falſe Prophet among them, the Infallibility of All and every one of them muſt be a Deceit; becauſe (out of* E. Burr.) *the Infallibility is aſſerted to belong to every One of them in particular.*

Re. 1. The firſt part is as good Logick, as to ſay, If we can prove but one Drunkard, or effeminate debauched Perſon, among the Clergy of *England*, then they are all Drunkards, *&c.* and their pretence to be all (and every one of them) Chriſt's Miniſters, is but a Deceit; but let him better conſider on't: True Prophets were not to ſuffer, nor to be branded for the falſe Prophet's Falſhood and Preſumption. See *Deut.* 18. 20, 21, 22. 2. Infallibility is no otherwiſe aſſerted to belong to every one, or any of us, than as we are led by the Spirit of Truth and taught thereby, a Manifeſtation whereof is given to every one to profit withal. But we do not therefore grant, that every (or any) falſe Prophet, belongs to us or our Society.

Sn.

Sn. p. 102, 103. *To his long Story of a Quaker-Glover in* Cheapside *who had his Till robb'd, and of a Quaker-Prophet miſtaken in the Perſon*, &c.

Re. 'Tis too long a Story to repeat, and ſeems deſigned to render us ridiculouſly odious; to which at preſent take the Anſwer following, till the Snake-man appears to bring forth better Proof.

THE Glover replies for himſelf, thinking it no Favour to have his Name concealed under a true ſtate of the Caſe, and minds his Author it is not ſafe nor warrantable to publiſh by Hear-ſay; for his Account is almoſt in every part falſe, containing at leaſt twelve plain Miſtakes at beſt. A natural Conſequence of being over-officious and medling in other Mens Affairs; which he is the readier to let him know, that if he will pleaſe to appear Face to Face, and hath two Ears, may be yet better informed by him; who is willing to join Iſſue with him in his great many more Inſtances, as he ſaith.

Nath. Marks.

Among his many repeated Falſhoods, there is ſomething of Truth hinted about one he calls a Prophet (although never ſo eſteemed by us) who not keeping in Humility, true Fear and Watchfulneſs (as the Light

Light of the Lord would have guided him) the Enemy prevailed to hurry him (by the ſhrength of Imagination and a ſecret diſcompoſure of Mind) wrongfully to charge a Perſon with the Fact, for which he has been reprehended and teſtified againſt; and we deſire the Lord may truly humble that Perſon unto true Repentance. Is it juſt to reproach all for this one Man's Offence? Would this Accuſer be ſo dealt by, from the groſs Miſcarriages of many of his eſteemed reverend Brethren of the Clergy? Or becauſe ſome of them have run Mad, would he and the reſt be ſo deemed? We trow not.

Sn. p. 104, 105. *Theſe Quaker-Prophets reſolv'd to try their Hands round, ſince they had begun, and ſee if they could terrifie ſome or other to confeſs their Infallibility.*

Re. What Prophets, and how many, did ſo reſolve? This is a foul Aſperſion, mix'd with the other falſe and partial Story, to defame us, and to invalidate our Chriſtian Teſtimony which is to the *Spirit* of Truth and its *Infallibility.*

Sn. p. 112. *Now it is made apparent that that Spirit which poſſeſſes them (i. e.* the Quakers) *is the very Spirit of Lies, which is the Spirit of the Devil; and conſequently that their Light within is Darkneſs; and then, as our Saviour ſaid,* O how great is that Darkneſs!

Re.

Re. What a blaſphemous, ſcornful and defaming Wretch is this? 1. Thus to defame and condemn a ſober religious People, as poſſeſt with the Spirit of the Devil, from ſome perſonal Miſtakes, Failings and Weakneſſes. 2. Thus to condemn the Principle (*i. e.* our Light within) as great Darkneſs, becauſe of ſome perſonal Miſcarriages, or Darkneſs prevailing, through their not walking in the true Light which we profeſs.

Sn. p. 113. *O therefore let thoſe Chriſtians beware, who are led away with pretences to the Spirit in any Men, not only againſt, but beſide that which is written, who break the Unity of the Church (which Chriſt calls the tearing of his own Body to pieces) and forſake the Communion of their lawful Biſhops, whom Chriſt has left as his own immediate Repreſentatives and Vice gerents, and as the Principles of Unity in their reſpective Churches.*

Re. This Story affects all Proteſtant Diſſenters, how conſcientious ſoever any of them are, as if they were all led by an ill Spirit, againſt Scripture, to break the Unity of the Church of Chriſt, and tear his Body to pieces, and to forſake the Communion of Chriſt's own immediate Repreſentatives and Vice-gerents. Very high Charges indeed, but we deny them; he muſt produce ſome better Proofs than his own

ipſe

ipſe dixit, or thus impoſing upon *Diſſenting Proteſtants*. And ſuppoſe ſome ſuch Diſſenters ſhould deny a Church, guilty of ſevere Perſecution, to be the Church or Body of Chriſt; and ſuch Biſhops as have countenanced Perſecution, to be his Vice-gerents; and therefore cannot in Conſcience hold Communion with them, or with that Church; what proof will he bring to ſatisfie the Denyers thereof? See what follows.

Sn. p. 115. Sect. 10. *Tho' God ſent many Prophets to reprove the Kings and the Prieſts, yet they neither rebelled againſt the Kings, nor ſet up oppoſite Altars againſt thoſe of theſe wicked Prieſts: But AS they paid all dutiful Obedience to their perſecuting Kings, and ſuffered Martyrdom under them without reſiſtance; SO did they always keep in the Communion of thoſe ſame Prieſts, whom they had provok'd and reprov'd, and paid all due Obedience to their ſacred Authority.*

Re. 1ſt. That God ſent Prophets to reprove the wickedneſs of Kings and Prieſts, and the Covteouſneſs, Idolatry, Prophaneneſs and Perſecution of corrupt and polluted Prieſts, is true; and that true Prophets patiently ſuffered by both. 2. But that the true Prophets did always keep *in the Communion* of thoſe ſame corrupted, polluted and wicked Prieſts, whom they had reproved (as aſſerted) we deny; for the

Holy

Holy Prophets had a distinct, pure Communion, from that of the polluted Priests. 3. 'Tis no better than a piece of Popery thus to plead for keeping Communion with wicked Priests, and Obedience to their Authority as *sacred* (when they have no *divine* or sacred Authority,) being debased by their own Iniquity. This is to make People Vassals to a corrupt Priesthood, such as the holy Prophets testified against, and as God overthrew, for their Covetousness, Idolatry and Wickedness; the great Corruption of Priests, is sufficient cause to dissent and separate from them.

Sn. p. 124, 125. *Their Churches have censur'd these Separatists, and consequently given Judgment against the Light within particular Persons.*

Re. The Consequence is falsly deduced; for where the Separation is a Self-separation, for which no just Cause is or can be assigned, or Corruption charged upon the Society or Church from whom the Separation is made; 'tis unwarrantable, and not arising from the true Light in any particular Persons; and therefore, the Judgment against such a Self-separation is not against the Light, but against a Fruit of the Flesh and Darkness: The Lord requires a Separation from the Unclean; but not from the Congregation of his People, nor from the Flocks of his Companions.

Sn.

Sn. p. 128. *The Ground of this Perſecution againſt* G. Keith, *was his preaching Chriſt without, or a perſonal Chriſt in Heaven, beſides the Light within, which he ſaid was only the ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt, by his Light and Life in all his Children.*

P. 130. *They do not really believe in any other Saviour than their own Light within, which they call Chriſt; and ſo endeavour to amuſe us.*

Re. 1. We never underſtood that *G. K.* was proſecuted for preaching Chriſt without in Heaven, and only his ſpiritual Preſence by his Light and Life in all his Children, ſeeing this is all ſtill but one and the ſame indiviſible Chriſt, and not two Chriſts; Chriſt as in the Heavens and as in our Hearts, is not divided. There were other Matters charg'd againſt *G. K.* of his turbulent Spirit and Behaviour, making Diviſions, Parties, Separations, *&c.* 2. We do really believe in the intire Chriſt of God, who was ſent to be the Saviour and Light of the World, that enlightens every Man coming into it; and he is our Light, Life and Salvation; and this can amuſe none but them that walk in Darkneſs.

Sn. p. 140. *That* G. K. *upon the Text,* 1 John 1. 7. *ſaid, It ought to be taken literally, that it was the outward ſhedding of Chriſt's*

Blood * *which cleanſeth from Sin; and that this was not to be reſolved into the Light within, nor to be ſpiritualiz'd away from the Letter.*

* The Act of ſhedding that outward Blood was by the Spear which the Soldier thruſt into his Side: How proves he that Act cleanſeth from Sin?

Re. Let us be excuſed, if we cannot take that Text, 1 *John* 1. 7. altogether literally; if cleanſing from all Sin, be a ſpiritul and inward Work or Act, as no doubt it is, there's as much aſcribed to the Spirit as to the Blood, in reſpect to the Work of Sanctification, Waſhing and Cleanſing from Sin. And therefore the Blood of Chriſt may be both taken ſpiritually and literally; and this is not to ſpiritualize away the Letter relating to the outward Blood and Sacrifice of Chriſt, ſeeing we have always believed, both in the *Letter*, and receive the Fruit thereof in the Spirit.

Sn. p. 148. Sect. 11. *Theſe Men, whoſe chief Principle is to decry and damn the Letter.*

Re. This is a moſt groſs and foul Calumny. Our preferring the Spirit to the Letter, as the Apoſtles did, is no decrying nor damning the Letter, nor ſo intended by us, but to bring People to the Life and Subſtance, and real fulfilling of Scripture.

To

To what he ſaith in diſtinction between *Chriſt the Word of God*, and the Book of Scriptures, *p.* 151, 152. this makes for us, and againſt them, who have often affirmed that Book to be the *Word*, in oppoſition to our owning Chriſt to be the Word, of whom the Scriptures teſtifie. And this, on our part, is no Contempt of the Holy Scriptures, nor *in their place* any *deifying of our own Spirit and our own Scriptures*, as this Adverſary moſt falſly accuſeth us, *p.* 152.

His moſt ſeeming pretence for Proof againſt us, of *Contempt of Holy Scripture*, is in p. 142. Sect. 11. where he quotes a Paſſage out of a Book, Entituled, *The Quaker's Refuge*, &c. thus: *viz.* " Whether the " firſt Pen-man of the Scriptures was *Moſes* " or *Hermes?* Or, whether both theſe are " not one? Or, whether there are not ma- " ny Words contained in the Scriptures, " which were not ſpoken by Inſpiration of " the Holy Spirit? Whether ſome Words " were not ſpoken by the grand Impoſtor; " ſome by wicked Men; ſome by wiſe Men, " ill applied; ſome by good Men, ill ex- " preſs'd; ſome by falſe Prophets, and yet " true; ſome by true Prophets, and yet " falſe ——

And here the Accuſer breaks off in his Citation, like as *F. Bugg* uſed to deal by us, who has the ſame Paſſage to defame us as he

hath done. Whereas next after the Words, *And yet falſe*, theſe follow, *viz. Is not the Subject of my Argument at this time.* Here 'tis plain the Author *R. R.* has cited theſe Queſtions about the Scriptures, not as the Subject of his own Argument, but of ſome others; he would not then be concerned to diſpute thoſe Queſtions or Doubts. For the ſaid Author farther confeſſeth, "That "ſuch Scriptures and Propheſies as have "been written and propheſied by the Holy "Men of God, as they were moved by his "Spirit, treating of the Myſtery of God "in the Redemption and Salvation of Man-"kind by Jeſus Chriſt, and the Duty of "Man in his Obedience to, and Worſhip "of the ſame God, as his reaſonable Ser-"vice; for the Gift of ſo great Salvation "are the great Concerns now under our "moſt ſerious Conſideration.

From hence it's clear the Author was no Contemner of Holy Scripture; and 'tis clear, the Subject of his Argument was for the Authority of the Holy Spirit, in judging or diſcerning the Mind of God in the Holy Scriptures, as truly own'd by the Quakers, thus in the ſaid Book, *Quaker's Refuge*, p. 17. which could not intend any Contempt of the Holy Scriptures; much leſs a *deifying either of our own Spirit* (*i. e.* the Spirit of Man) or *our own Writings in their place.*

We

We have rarely ever met with more mad, unlikely and improbable Aſperſions than theſe, from our moſt outragious Adverſaries.

To what is objected, p. 155. Sect. 11. *viz. That they* (*i. e.* the Quakers) *cannot be bound by any Command in the Scriptures, unleſs their Spirit anew require the ſame.* This is falſly ſtated; 'tis not our own Spirit (*i. e.* the Spirit of Man abſtractly) that we profeſs to be under the Conduct of, but the ſame Spirit which gave forth the Holy Scriptures. And is not awanting to require of us the performance of its own neceſſary Commands and Doctrins contained in the Scriptures, ſeeing 'tis the ſame Spirit which leads it's ſincere Followers into all Truth; conſequently not to undervalue any of thoſe bleſſed Truths recorded in the Holy Scriptures. And therefore this Adverſary's Conſequence intended againſt us, *viz. That the Scripture remains of no Authority with us*, p. 155. is very unjuſt, being deduced from his own falſe Suggeſtions, ſuppoſing us to ſet the Spirit in oppoſition to the Scriptures of Truth, whereas we plead for the divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, in ſo much preferring the Holy Spirit from whence they proceeded and derive their Authority, and not from Human Tradition. And this is far from *ſpiritualizing away* all the

Letter of the Scripture, or *Christ's Humanity*, as in p. 166. as we are often unjustly aspersed.

To what he saith, *p.* 168. *That Enthusiasts have no Principles; they have no Rule but their own Fancy, which is strongest in mad Men, and this they mistake for Inspiration; and then their Madness is at the height.*

We say, take Enthusiasm in the truest and best Sense, and then such are inspired of God; and by his Inspiration, have a true Understanding and right Principles given them, both Divine and Moral, and do not mistake *Fancy* for *Divine Inspiration*. But to whom does the Man apply this Enthusiasm which he renders *Fancy*, more strong in *mad Men* and height of *Madness*? In his next Page 'tis to the Quakers.

He says, *No Quaker can deny but that the Principle of the Quakers is all Enthusiasm, There never was any Enthusiasm in the World that exceeded it*, p. 169. Sect. 11.

Here he seems to take *Enthusiasm* in the Quaker's Sense, which is Divine Inspiration or *inspired of God*; which sure cannot be *meer Fancy*, much less the height of *Madness* (as before.) The Quakers certainly deny this of themselves: Thus the Man's confused in's injurious Attempts to defame us with the *height of Madness*.

His

His Objection againſt the Quaker's *Enthuſiaſm*, (as he calls it) *That none that ever called themſelves Chriſtians have advanced themſelves ſo high, to have the ſame infallible Spirit and immediate Revelation as the Prophets and Apoſtles, or as Chriſt himſelf*, &c. p. 169.

Herein he's greatly out: All true Chriſtians are Partakers of the Spirit of Chriſt in ſome degree or meaſure; for he that hath not the Spirit of Chriſt is none of his, and his Spirit is infallible; and a Manifeſtation of the ſame Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal, and the Effuſion of this Spirit upon all Fleſh was promiſed; and we believe the Promiſes of God, which are all *Yea* and *Amen* in Chriſt Jeſus. Therefore this out Adverſary, who is ſo much averſe to having the ſame infallible Spirit, and ſo oppoſite to Infallibility, is none of Chriſt's, conſequently no Chriſtian. And he does but follow his own *fallible* Spirit, (being prompted on by the Father of Lies) in what he writes againſt us, conſequently of no Credit therein; ſo like one of thoſe falſe Prophets that follow their own Spirits, and ſee nothing.

But then ſeverely to aggravate the Matter againſt us *poor Madmen* (in his eſteem) he'll needs have it, *That the height of our Self-advancement is to be equal even to God; to be one Perſon, Subſtance and Soul with God*: And he

does not think that any Human Government can be ſecure of Men, in whoſe Power it is to ſcrew themſelves up to ſuch blaſphemous heights of Enthuſiaſm, p. 169, 170.

We Anſwer; 'Tis better to be mad Men and Fools, than to be ſcrewed up by the Father of Lies to ſuch a height of Malice and Outrage, as this inſulting and railing *Rabſhekah* appears to be puft up in. When did ever the Quakers ſo advance themſelves, *to be one Perſon, Subſtance, Soul with God, and equal even to God?* We poſitively deny the Charge, and the Words themſelves (but only as we are united or joined to the Lord we are one Spirit) and give this Perſon leave to ſecure ſuch Perſons in *Bedlam*, if he can find any among us, that he can plainly prove to hold the ſame as he charges. And therefore his inſinuating ſuch preſumptuous Blaſphemies againſt the Quakers in general, to render them ſo highly obnoxious, and the Government inſecure of them; this is highly and deadly malicious; and he might as well have taken one Step further to have ſhewn his Teeth, and have told the Government what he would have done with the Quakers; how he would have them dealt with to be ſecure of them; whether he would have them cloſely Confin'd, Hang'd or Baniſh'd; for take our Word, his Charge is very high againſt them, and implies no

ſmall

ſmall Reflection upon the Civil Government, for ſo kindly ſuffering and indulging ſuch extreamly pernicious mad Folks, as he has over and over rendred the Quakers; which ſerves but to evince the Folly of his own Fury and Madneſs, againſt a peaceable innocent People.

P. 153. Sect. 11. To his ridiculing *Womens Preaching and Womens Meetings*, &c.

1. We do not *inſtitute Womens Preachings* as he ſaith, but leave them free to the Gift and Call of God.

2. Neither hath he proved that they are univerſally and perpetually forbidden to ſpeak in the Church, by that 1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. The Apoſtle *Paul* did not intend to make void God's Promiſe of the pouring out of his Spirit upon Sons and Daughters to propheſie, *Joel* 2. 28, 29. *Acts* 2. 17, 18. No, he allowed Women to Pray or Propheſie, when ſo divinely indued and inſpired thereunto, 1 *Cor.* 11. 5, 13.

3. Our Scoffer tells us of *the Prelacy of Womens Meetings*; *which he calls an Invention never heard of in the World, till* G. F. *cobled it out.*

As for the Term *Prelacy* 'tis his own, given in his Scorn and Ignorance. As for our Womens Meetings, what has the Scorner againſt them or their Services, more

than

than his own Ignorance and Scorn? We know Them and their Help and Service to be truly Chriſtian and Charitable, conſequently to be of the Lord; their Intent and Service being to be helpful in their Places, for promoting true Chriſtian Charity and Religion in Life and Practice, and particularly with regard to Fatherleſs and Widows among us, that they may not be neglected, but Viſited and Miniſtred unto in their Afflictions, for their neceſſary Relief and Comfort. And theſe Meetings are very expedient and convenient for Intelligence among them, of ſuch Objects of Charity and Compaſſion. There were *Deaconeſſes*, as well as *Deacons*, in the Primitive Chriſtian Churches.

4. This Church-man has no reaſon to deride or contemn our Women's Meetings; we charge not his Church with our Poor, tho' we help to Relieve the Poor of his Church, both Pariſh-poor and Beggars, to his and their Shame be it ſpoken, who blindly ridicules our Chriſtian Care and Charitable Methods in this Matter.

In Sect. 12. concerning the Light within. "That the Light which lightneth every "Man coming into the World, being the "divine Word the Son of God, is not na-"tural Reaſon or Conſcience, but above "both and enlightneth both, is true, be-

cauſe

cauſe divine and univerſally in every Man; and therefore we do not by Virtue of this Light, *advance our ſelves above all Mankind, nor damn all but our ſelves*, as is falſly ſuggeſted againſt us, *p.* 171. But as we are turned and converted from Darkneſs unto this Light, the Lord hath advanced us above what we our ſelves were in our natural and unconverted State, and above all others who yet remain in that ſtate. To the Queſtion, *Whether a Man can ſin while he follows this Light?* p. 172. *Anſw.* No, nor in his truly following it. And that he *cannot leave the Light*, without knowing it or being followed with Judgment and Conviction thereof by the Light, is true alſo. Whence it does not follow *that there can be no Sin of Ignorance*, as is wrongfully inferred, *p.* 173. For there are Sins of Ignorance before Conviction and Converſion, whilſt Men walk in Darkneſs, being ignorant of the Light that ſhines in it, and their Minds eſtranged from it; but after convicted, or Converſion in meaſure, if they backſlide in Heart and leave the Light, they cannot be left altogether ignorant of their backſliding, becauſe they ſhall be left without Excuſe, who either through their impenitent hard Hearts treaſure up Wrath to themſelves, or backſlide in Heart, or wilfully ſin until judicially hardned, after they have received the know-

knowledge of the Truth. 1. Becauſe of God's univerſal Call and Viſitation by his Light and Free Grace in Chriſt to Sinners. 2. Becauſe of his ſwiftly purſuing the Wicked, and all them that forſake him, by his Spirit of Judgment: For theſe, and other Cauſes, they are all inexcuſable before him, and the Light will purſue them even to Hell, as it did the rich Man when in Hell he lift up his Eyes, *Luke* 16. 23, 28. To what our Oppoſer objects from theſe Scriptures, *Luke* 23. 34. *John* 16. 2. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 11. *Mat.* 6. 23. *Acts* 3. 17. 1 *Cor.* 2. 8. thence inferring againſt the *Infallibility* of the Light within, and ſaying, *There can be no ſuch Miſtake as our Saviour ſuppoſes*, (Mat. 6. 23.) *If the Light within be infallible, and that every Man has it, and that no Man can leave it without knowing of it*, p. 174. To all which we Anſwer, That ſome Men's Ignorance of their Maſter's Will, others wrong Thoughts, others being given up to ſtrong Deluſion to believe a Lie, others greatly miſtaking Darkneſs for Light (and then how great is that Darkneſs of theirs?), Theſe can be no Proofs againſt the Infallibility of the Light it ſelf, nor of the Light within being fallible, but of their own Tranſgreſſion, Diſobedience and Rebellion againſt the Light; *Who know not the ways of the Light, becauſe they abide not in the Paths of it*, Job 24. 13.

And

And though there's no Sin againſt the Light or Backſliding from it, without ſome Conviction at one time or other, yet 'tis poſſible for ſome to preſume to ſin, rebel and ſhut their Eyes ſo long, until they become ſtark blind and hardned in ſinning and paſt feeling in Rebellion, and given over to hardneſs of Heart and to ſtrong Deluſion to believe a Lie, and ſo to Damnation and Deſtruction; yet however clouded all this while, the Light in them remains in it ſelf pure, certain, and an infallible ſwift Witneſs againſt the Rebellious, who love Darkneſs and the Works thereof, rather than the Light which is come into the World. Mens thinking themſelves to be in the *right* when miſtaken, *p.* 174, 175. (having their Underſtandings darkned) will not deſtroy all (or any of) the Quakers certainty which they have in the true Light, as they believe and walk therein.

P. 176, 177. It was hard for *Saul* to Kick againſt the Pricks; *and that is againſt the Power of Chriſt, which would be too hard for him, if he ſtrove againſt it,* as is confeſt: No doubt that Power reached his Conſcience when awakened and convicted, conſequently thoſe Pricks which that gave him were then in him; and that Power or Holy Ghoſt which *Stephen*'s Perſecutors and *Saul* alſo reſiſted, (when he kept their Garments while they

they ſtoned him and conſented to his Death) was near them to convict and condemn them for their Perſecution and Cruelty, but their Fury, Wrath and Violence, would not permit them to adhere or ſubmit to the ſtrivings thereof, for they *always reſiſted the ſame Holy Spirit as did their Fathers*, Acts 7.51. Which Reſiſtance of theirs implies the Spirit's ſecretly ſtriving with them and giving Counſel againſt their Wickedneſs and Cruelty; for how can there be always a reſiſting that which either is not, or moves not, or counſels not? O therefore the ſame Holy Spirit and Light of it, was in them in ſome meaſure moving and ſtriving with them, to perſuade, ſtop and reclaim them from thoſe deſtructive Courſes and Enormities they had choſen. And here we may obſerve how he excuſes the *Miniſtry*, *where People are not converted by it*, he deems it *a very bad Argument to blame the Miniſtry; for Mens being Evil may proceed from their own Perverſneſs, and not from the Fault of the Miniſtry*, Pref. p. 57. May we not retalliate ſuch Argument for the Light within, *That 'tis a very bad Argument that the Light within is either inſufficient or fallible, becauſe Men are Evil, or blind or miſtaken?* Which may proceed from their own Diſobedience or Perverſeneſs, and not from any defect or fault in the Light given them. And when *Saul* thought

thought with himſelf that he ought to do many things contrary to the Name of Jeſus of *Nazareth*, and was zealous in perſecuting and impriſoning the Chriſtians, and exceeding mad againſt them, *Acts* 26. 9, 10. 11. This was in his blind deceived State, when a Follower of the perſecuting Prieſts, and the more blinded by ſuch blind Guides as hate the true Light and oppoſe it; *For*, as *Paul* ſaith, *I perſecuted this way unto the Death, binding and delivering into Priſon both Men and Women*, Acts 22. 4. *For many of the Saints I ſhut up in Priſon, having received Authority of the High Prieſts, and when they were put to Death, I gave my Sentence*, Acts 26. 10. So that the Prieſts were very ill Inſtruments to influence and miſguide him in Perſecution and Cruelty, contrary to the Light; ſuch his Blindneſs, Madneſs and injurious Perſecution againſt the Saints, to Impriſonment and Death, being expreſly contrary to the Law of God without them and within them, in Scripture and Conſcience. Will any be ſo blind, as to ſuppoſe God did not afford them ſo much Light, as to ſhew them ſuch groſs Iniquities and Injuries to others who were innocent? How impertinent and ſenſeleſs then is the Man's Queſtion, *viz.* *Had* Paul *then any Pricks of Conſcience, or of his Light within againſt the lawfulneſs of that wherein he was fully perſuaded and zealous?* p. 177.

No

No doubt he had ſo much Light in him, as would both have prickt him for, and ſhewn the Unlawfulneſs of his Perſecution and Cruelty againſt the Saints, if he would have inclined his Mind to it for Counſel, and not to the Prieſts who encouraged him in Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians, which they perſuaded him to, and not the Light. They helped to make him ſo mad againſt the Saints as he was; but Chriſt the Light, whoſe Power prickt him, made him wiſe when converted; and tho' 'tis poſſible that in his Hurry and Fury to Perſecution, he might not at that very inſtant feel the Pricks of the Light in's Conſcience, yet it ſwiftly purſued him and ſeiz'd him, when Chriſt had wonderfully put a ſtop to him and his Letters and Errand from the High Prieſts to perſecute the Saints. Tho' the Candle of the Wicked may be many times put out, 'tis lighted again. For how oft is the Candle of the Wicked put out? How oft is Deſtruction upon him? If it be often put out, 'tis often lighted. And therefore all theſe things ſeriouſly conſider'd, we do not ſee it any hard Matter to make ſenſe of the *Quakers Notion* (as he calls it) of the Light within, nor that this Inſtance of St. *Paul can ſtand as any irrefragable* (or other) *Proof againſt it*; or, our Teſtimony for that true Light which inlightens every Man coming into the

the World, *John* 1. 4, 9. Becauſe many are blinded by the perſecuting and covetous Prieſts, and many ſhut their Eyes againſt the Light, and many love Darkneſs rather than Light, becauſe their Deeds are evil, and the Candle of the Wicked is often put out. But they ſhall all find it hard to Kick againſt the Pricks even in their own Conſciences, as 'tis confeſſed even in the Engliſh Annotation, in the Margin, on *Acts* 9. 5. *It is hard for thee to Kick againſt the Pricks*, i. e. *to reſiſt God when he pricketh and ſolliciteth our Conſciences*; therefore ſuch prickings are within.

All which truly conſider'd, 'tis no difficulty to make Senſe of the *Quaker's Notion* (as he calls it) *of the Light within*, p. 178. ſeeing 'tis according to the expreſs Senſe of Holy Scripture-Teſtimony thereof, and the Senſe which the Light gives all them that truly regard it, Chriſt being the Light of the World that inlightens every Man coming into it, that whoſoever believe in his Light and follow him the Light, might not abide in Darkneſs but have the Light of Life, and become Children of the Light. Neither doth our Adverſary's Inſtance of St. *Paul* (or others) ſtand as any irrefragable Proof againſt the Light within, or the Quakers Notion of it, as he vainly ſuppoſeth, p. 178. Unleſs it be a good Argument, that becauſe

ſome Men are Blind, and others ſhut their Eyes, there's no Sun in the Firmament giving Light into their Houſes. We find no better Proof or Argument from this Adverſary againſt the Light within, or our Teſtimony thereof; and 'tis far more difficult to make Senſe of his Notion of the Light within, than of our's: For after he has in Words owned and confeſſed to Divine Illumination or Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, as that *Enthuſiaſm or Inſpiration of God, which is allowed and owned in their Church, and that 'tis full as much as any ſober Quaker can mean by the Light within*, Pref. from p. 46. to p. 55, 56. Another while he'll have the Light within *not Infallible*, but Fallible, becauſe of Men's Miſtake, who put Darkneſs for Light, p. 173, 174. 2d Part. Another while he'll have the Light within *no Light*, from *Iſa.* 8. 20. placing this Remark upon it, *No Light, George*; mark that, p. 251. But he ſhould have obſerved the Hebrew Note in the Margin, *No Morning*, inſtead of *No Light*, which I may return upon him. If they ſpeak not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is *No Morning* to them. *No Morning!* Man; mark that. But is there no Light before Morning, pray? Now how difficult is it to make Senſe of this Man's Notion of the Light within? One while with him, 'Tis a Divine Inſpiration; another while,

'Tis

'Tis Fallible; another while, No Light: So that one while 'tis a divine, good and certain Light; another while uncertain, not Infallible; another while 'tis nothing, no Light. Thus confusedly and madly Envy and Darkness appears against the true Light.

This Adversary, to prove his false, reiterrated black Charge, *That the Quakers take to themselves the very Attributes of God; and make a pretence, from this Light within, to excuse blasphemous Pride, assuming All the Worship due to Christ whom they call this Light, upon the account of his or its Inhabitation in them*, p. 178. He refers to *G. Whitehead's Innocency against Envy*, p. 18. Sect. 12. in Answer to *F. Bugg*, *viz.* As to his Charge of *idolatrous* if not *blasphemous* Names and Titles given to *G. F.* How proves he that they (*i. e.* Two Persons in their Letters to him) gave and intended those Names and Titles to the Person of *G. F. &c.* This Story, in the first part, is notoriously false, as it affects the Quakers in general. The last part is a blind Story, as 'tis intended for Proof of the black Charge before; those idolatrous Names and Titles are not mentioned, nor any plain Proof of the exact Copies of both those Letters could we ever have. And *G. W.* has further cleared this Matter in another Answer to *F. B.* as also in

his *Juſt Inquiry*, from p. 19. to p. 30. And in behalf of the People called Quakers, we poſitively and ſincerely deny; 1. That they take to themſelves the very Attributes of God. 2. That they excuſe blaſphemous Pride, as that of aſſuming all Worſhip due to Chriſt, becauſe of his inhabiting in them: Theſe, with Deteſtation, we ſolemnly deny. But this Accuſer ſhould have looked at home, and at his Brethren of the Clergy, what Honour and Attributes do they give to their Biſhops, when they go down upon their Knees to them, as their *Reverend Fathers in God*, with *Your Grace*, *My Lord*, &c. Do theſe import Divine Honour and Divine Attributes, or Earthly, pray? And where did ever Chriſt's Miniſters or Apoſtles, do ſuch Homage to *Timothy* or *Titus*, or call either of them my Lord *Timothy*, or my Lord *Titus*, and Your Grace, *&c?* And what thinks he of *Godfathers and Godmothers?* Are not theſe Divine Attributes, and very high ones too? And of their being *Sureties* for Infants, for their forſaking the Devil and all his Works, *&c.* and keeping God's holy Will and Commandments, *&c.* Do they not herein take upon them Chriſt's Office and Work, who is our Surety? And what Scripture have they for theſe? Anſwer directly.

'Tis

'Tis a notorious Untruth alſo, *That they (i. e.* the Quakers) *allow of divine Honour to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, on no other account than as* G. W. *allows it to* G. Fox; *that is, becauſe of the reſiding of the divine Word in him,* p. 180. We ſay this is apparently falſe; for on divers other Accounts we allow divine Honour; and far more Honour to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, than to any mortal or finite Creature whatſoever, as in all things Chriſt Jeſus hath the Preheminence, and all Fulneſs dwelling in him, and all Power in Heaven and Earth committed to him, and were not all the Angels of God to worſhip him? And all Men to honour the Son, as they honour the Father? Therefore this Oppoſer's blaſphemous Conſequences drawn againſt us, from his black Charge aforeſaid, *As worſhipping one another with divine Honour, and not grudging to apply all the Attributes of God to themſelves for the Light within ſake,* &c. p. 181, 182. with the reſt of his Conſequences of the ſame kind, are as falſe as the other. We deſire ever to walk humbly with God in Chriſt Jeſus, in a holy Reverence and Worſhip to him only, to whom all divine Worſhip, Glory and Honour is due.

In his 13th Sect. *Of the Reſurrection of the Body. This* (ſaith he) *the Quakers do poſitively deny*, p. 182.

Here he ſtumbles at the Threſhold, and deals diſingeniouſly and falſly with the Quakers. They deny not the Reſurrection of the Body, by denying the groſs and carnal Notions of our former Adverſaries, of the ſelf-ſame *carnal and numerical Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones*; no more than the Apoſtle denied the Reſurrection of the Dead, by affirming, *That Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth Corruption inherit Incorruption*, 1 Cor. 15. For proof *That the Quakers do poſitively deny the Reſurrection*; he ſays, *That Mr.* Penn *makes Nonſenſe of it; and worſe, he compares it to Tranſubſtantiation, nay, to the Alcoran*; quoting *Reaſon againſt Railing*, 1673. p. 138. which is a plain Perverſion, and as falſe as the Charge it ſelf: For *W. Penn* does neither make Nonſenſe of the Reſurrection it ſelf, ſcripturally conſidered, nor compare it either to Tranſubſtantiation, or to the Alcoran: But *T. Hick's groſs Belief and Apprehenſion of a Carnal or Fleſhly Reſurrection of the ſelf-ſame Carnal Body; and yet that it ſhall be ſo changed, as to be a ſpiritual glorious Body, like unto Chriſt's.* This he compares to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, as the Papiſts ſay, That the Bread and Wine, after

Con-

Conſecration are ſo changed as to be the very Chriſt, and yet the Accidents remain (*i. e.* of Bread and Wine) ſo he can't make better Senſe of his Adverſary's groſs apprehenſion of the Reſurrection of the Body, being or remaining the ſame carnal Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones that's buried, and yet changed ſo as to be a ſpiritual and glorious Body, like unto Chriſt's, which was not to deny the Scripture-Doctrin of the Reſurrection it ſelf, but rather a carnal Alcoran Notion thereof; for in the Book quoted *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 133. And under the ſame Head, take *W. P.*'s plain Confeſſion of the Reſurrection in his own Words, againſt his Adverſary, *viz.* "Who can "have the Confidence to call the Scripture "his Rule, and yet contradict it ſo egregi- "ouſly, as when the Apoſtle tells us, It is "not the ſame Body that is ſown that ſhall "be, to aſſert that it is the ſame Body; "and that who ſays the contrary, denies "the Reſurrection and eternal Recompence, "(which is a very confident Perverſion and "Oppoſition to the Apoſtle's Doctrin.) In "ſhort, we do acknowledge a Reſurrection "in order to eternal Recompence, and "that every Seed ſhall have its own Body, "and reſt contented with what Body it "ſhall pleaſe God to give us (who giveth a "Body as it pleaſeth him, 1 *Cor.* 15.)

" But as we are not ſuch Fools as curiouſly " to enquire what? ſo muſt we for ever " deny the groſs Conceits of *T. H.* and his " Adherents, *&c.* And in concluſion of the ſame Head, *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 124. he ſaith, " For our parts *a Reſurrection we* " *believe, and of Bodies too*, unto Eternal " Life. What they ſhall not be, I have " briefly ſaid and proved; what they ſhall " be, we leave with God, who will give " every one a Body as it pleaſeth him; and " Thou Fool belongs to the unneceſſary " Medler.

Thus 'tis evident *W. P.* did not deny the Reſurrection it ſelf, nor count it Nonſenſe, *&c.* but the groſs Conceits of ſome Perſons about it: Conſequently, this Accuſer has charged the Quakers as falſly in this Point, as in the reſt.

And we know not *Thoſe others* (among us he tells of) *that ſuppoſe the Soul it ſelf is the ſpiritual Body mentioned*, 1 Cor. 15. 44. *and conſequently that there is no other Reſurrection than at each particular Perſons death*, p. 184. We know none in our Society hold or ſuppoſe theſe things; but the contrary, that the Soul of every Perſon ſhall be inveſted with its own proper ſpiritual Body, in the general Reſurrection and laſt Day. And beſides, the true Believers being quicken'd and raiſed out of the Fall in *Adam*, unto Life, Righ-

Righteouſneſs and Victory, in and by Jeſus Chriſt (who is the Reſurrection and the Life). Three things are alſo obſervable in that 1 *Cor.* 15. The Apoſtle argues, 1. for the Reſurrection of the Dead, from the Reſurrection of Chriſt, againſt ſome that ſaid, *There is no Reſurrection of the Dead.* 2. He argues againſt ſome, and reprehends them as *Fools* that queſtioned *How the Dead are raiſed, and with what Bodies do they come forth?* From the Wheat and other Grain that's ſown, and the difference between the Celeſtial and Terreſtrial Bodies, and the Natural Body and the Spiritual. 3. For thoſe Saints that ſhall remain alive at the coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to raiſe the Dead, that they ſhall be *changed in a moment, at the ſounding of the laſt Trumpet of God:* It's evident that the Apoſtle *Paul* fully anſwers both thoſe that ſaid there is *No Reſurrection* of the Dead, and alſo thoſe Fools that queſtion *With what Body do they come forth?* And aſſerts the ſudden change of thoſe who ſhall remain alive until the coming of the Lord from Heaven. So that the Reſurrection of the Dead, and final change of the Living, ſo as the Corruptible muſt put on Incorruption, and the Mortal ſhall put on Immortality. As this Doctrin was really believed by the Primitive Chriſtians, ſo it is by us, who believe that God raiſed

up

up Jeſus from the Dead; and therefore the Dead, both the Juſt and Unjuſt, ſhall be raiſed by Jeſus Chriſt according to Scripture, whatever Prejudice may ſuggeſt to the contrary.

But our Adverſary will needs have it, *That Mr.* Penn *does underſtand that long and elegant Deſcription of the Reſurrection of our Bodies, from the* 35*th* Verſe of the 15th Chap. of the firſt Epiſt. to the *Corinthians*, *Only of the ſpiritual ſtate of the Soul in this Life*; and for it quotes, *The Invalidity of* John Faldoe's *Vindication*, 1673. p. 373, & p. 369. He wrongs *W. P.* in this, *i. e. That he underſtands that long and elegant Deſcription of the Reſurrection*, (1 Cor. 15. 35. to the end.) *Only of the ſpiritual ſtate of the Soul in this Life.* I ſay this is a Perverſion and Abuſe of *W. P.*'s Diſcourſe in the Caſe; for on verſe 44. he utterly denies that this Text is concerned in the Reſurrection of Man's carnal Body; ſhewing, according to *Beza*, both from the Latin and Original Greek, that *a natural Body is ſown, a ſpiritual Body is raiſed*; that there's not a Word in either for the Relative *It*, *Inval.* p. 369. And in p. 373. *W. P.* ſuppoſing the Apoſtle treated of a natural Change, and not only of the ſpiritual ſtate of the Soul in this Life. This Suppoſition is not to underſtand the Apoſtle *Paul* to treat only of the ſpiritual ſtate of the Soul in this Life, in that 1 *Cor.* 15. from v. 35. For in the place quoted, it is by the Accuſed confeſſed,

That

That tho' *we ſow not the Body which ſhall be, God giveth a Body as it pleaſeth him*, from 1 Cor. 15. 37, 38.

'Tis obſervable, That *W. P.* (in his Anſwer to *T. Hicks* and *John Faldoe* quoted) is not ſo unnatural as not to allow the ſanctified Soul a ſuitable Clothing or Manſion, (when the earthly Tabernacle is diſſolved) which is eternal in the Heavens, according to 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. wherein it is undoubtedly happy, being in perfect Peace and Reſt with God in Chriſt Jeſus; but he alſo allows it a ſpiritual, celeſtial, glorious Body in the Reſurrection, far excelling the Terreſtrial. And we doubt not but we ſhall be the ſame (and as many) *diſtinct Souls*, Men (or Perſons) in the Reſurrection as we are now, though far better Clothed with our ſpiritual glorious Bodies, we hope. The Premiſes conſider'd, 'tis evident our Accuſer has as actually wronged us in this Point, even in Matter of Fact by Perverſion, as in his ſaying, *The Quakers have ſpiritualiz'd away all the Body and the Being of Chriſt into their Light within*, p. 195. which is all a notorious Untruth, and anſwered before.

To his Stories, 1. *Of a Quaker Preacher, to whom he urging for a proof of the Reſurrection*, Mat. 27. 52, 53. *That many Bodies of Saints aroſe and came out of the Graves after Chriſt's Reſurrection, and went into the Holy City and*

ap-

appeared unto many; *That he made this Answer, That was not meant of the literal or earthly* Jerusalem; *that any dead Bodies arose there, but of the spiritual* Jerusalem *which* John *saw coming down from Heaven.* 2. *And that others told him, They heard the same Exposition in a Quaker Sermon at one of their Meetings*, p. 196.

Answ. We know not any Preacher among us that gave such Meaning or Interpretation to the said Text, neither do we own it. And we have reason to question the truth of these Stories.

3. He says, *He can tell of a Preacher among the Quakers that said, He had already obtain'd the Resurrection by Christ, having risen in his Heart; and that he believed no other Resurrection, nor expected any*, p. 198.

We question the Truth of this Story also, in the last part of it, *viz. That he believed no other, nor expected any than Christ risen in him*, and this also of *no other* we disown; for as truly as we own Christ risen in us (and we in him from Sin and Condemnation) so truly do we believe and expect to be raised up by him in the last Day, above all Corruption and Mortality; we being raised in Christ from Sin here, we shall be raised by him to Glory hereafter. And therefore are not of the Opinion of *Hymeneus* and *Phyletus*, who said, *That the Resurrection is past*,

(or

(or made) *already*, 2 Tim. 2. 18. For that Reſurrection which *Paul* (in his converted ſtate when riſen with Chriſt) had not attained, *Phil.* 3. 11, 12. we do believe and expect as yet to come after this Life, and at the laſt Day.

Another Accuſation is, *That* G. F. *ſays plainly in theſe Words, There's none have a Glory and a Heaven but within them* (leaving out what follows) *which was before Man had a Being*, Gr. Myſt. p. 214.

This is intended of what the Saints *have* and *enjoy* in this Life, in the Preſent Tenſe, (and not of that more full attainment in that which is to come) who have and enjoy the indwelling of God and Chriſt, as their God and their Glory according to his Promiſe, having of this excellent Treaſure in their Earthen Veſſels, according to their meaſures of degrees of attainment, being changed from Glory to Glory (from one degree of Glory to another) as by the Spirit of God. There's no doubt but all true and ſpiritual Believers, who are dead with Chriſt, and whoſe Life is hid with Chriſt in God, when Chriſt who is their Life ſhall at laſt appear, they ſhall *appear* with him in *Glory*, Col. 3. Yea, in far more Glory than's here attainable in a mortal State. Though we are now the Sons of God, yet it appears not what we ſhall then be; but when Chriſt

appears

appears we ſhall be like him, for we ſhall ſee him as he is, 1 *John* 3. 2. Heaven, which is God's Throne and Dwelling-place, is no doubt ſo ſpacious, and the Heavens which declare his Glory ſo wonderfully extenſive, that we cannot ſuppoſe they ſhould all be contain'd in the narrow compaſs of our Hearts, though our Converſation be now in Heaven, and we come to a heavenly ſtate in Chriſt Jeſus. Therefore we do not confine all our expected Attainments of Heaven and Glory to within us in this Life, but the way to attain more thereof in that which is to come, is to *partake of ſame ſhare thereof in Chriſt Jeſus*, even in this Life, and where Chriſt is enjoy'd, there Heaven and Glory is in meaſure ſpiritually enjoy'd, there being ſpiritual and inward Heavens, as well as natural and outward.

Note, For the ſpirituality of the *Reſurrection*, *Bodies*, and the nature of the Body of Chriſt after his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, Our Oppoſer may peruſe *H. Moor's Search into the nature of a glorified Body*, Apol. ch. 3. p. 494. Of his *Modeſt Enquiry into the Myſtery of Iniquity*. And compare the ſame with what we have written on that Subject, and then let our Oppoſer anſwer him, having been a Doctor of his own Church, and Philoſopher alſo of Repute in *Cambridge*, &c.

As

As to his 14th Sect. *Of the Sacraments*, (as he terms them) but without Scripture-proof of the Term *Sacrament*, as applied to the outward Elements, Signs or Shadows, which end in Christ the Substance, who livingly represents himself beyond them, by his Spirit in the Hearts and Souls of spiritual Believers, who have attained unto the spiritual Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, and to partake of his spiritual Supper with him, *Rev.* 3. 10.

The difference between us and our Accuser in this Point, is about the Text, *1 Cor.* 11. 26. of shewing forth the Lord's Death till he come, as he says *By the Celebration of his last Supper*, Whether this *coming of Christ be spiritually in our Hearts, or at the Resurrection at the last Day, which ends the time limited for the Celebration thereof?* We believe it of the first (if that may be owned as any real coming of Christ) He of the last. His Reason is, *That Christ was so come in the Hearts of the Holy Apostles and of the purest Primitive Christians.* The Apostle's condescending to divers Things that were Shadows and Figures for sometime; it follows not that therefore, we are bound to imitate them in all things they did. Neither were the *Corinthians* the purest of Primitive Christians when *Paul* writ his first Epistle to them; nor had they then so far attained to

the

the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, as to confirm and make them blameless as in his Day, but then waited for such his coming, 1 *Cor.* 1. for there were divers Disorders among them, and many of them carnal and walked as Men. And therefore they were not then of the purest of Christians; though they had good Gifts, yet they had then great need to wait for the coming of Christ to make them better, to bring them into a blameless state. The Apostles themselves were come to higher Attainments in Christ Jesus, which they laboured to bring their Hearers to, as is evident from *Paul*'s desiring *That the* Corinthians *might not be ignorant how that all the Fathers, who were baptized unto* Moses *in the Cloud and in the Sea, did all eat the same spiritual Meat and drink of the spiritual Rock which followed them or went with them, which Rock was Christ*, 1 Cor. 10. And told them the Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? And the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many are *One* Bread and *One* Body, being all Partakers of the *One Bread*, ver. 16, 17. and doubtless the knowledge of this Mystery was *what he received of the Lord*, which was above the Sign, Shadow or Figure thereof. Yet 'tis not to be questioned, but there was a good

In-

Intention in the firſt Propoſal and Practice of thoſe outward Memorials of Chriſt's Death among the *Corinthians*, in the capacity they ſtood in, to remember and ſhew forth Chriſt's Death thereby, until they knew and had more of his Life to ſhew forth, in a holy and unblameable State and Converſation in the Day of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, for whoſe ſpiritual coming they waited, for that end, 1 *Cor.* 1. 6, 7, 8. And alſo that they might *flee from Idolatry* and keep out of it, and forbear eating in the Idols Temple, which he warned them againſt. As to Chriſt's Celebration of his laſt Supper, 'tis ſtrange that ſhould be ſo much urg'd as obligatory upon us, until *Chriſt's laſt coming again at the Reſurrection in the laſt Day*; ſeeing we find none of the Urgers thereof ſo much as in a true imitation of the laſt Supper of Chriſt, where he eat the legal Paſſover with his Diſciples, according to his own appointment, this part of the Supper being laid aſide as Jewiſh, fulfilled and ended by Chriſt. And therefore to us that laſt Supper of Chriſt appears to be a Conſummation and fulfilling of the Jewiſh ſolemn Feaſts, under the Law, * as *John*'s Baptiſm was, of the di-

* See *T. Godwyn's Moſes and Aaron*, treating of the *Paſſover*, &c. and Chriſt's anſwering the ſame in his Supper, *Exod.* 12. *Mat.* 26. 18, 19. *Luke* 22. 8. to ver. 15.

yers legal Waſhings (or Baptiſms) impoſed, until the time of Reformation, when Chriſt blotted out and nailed the Hand-writing of Ordinances to his Croſs. After which, they were not legally obligatory, though condeſcended unto for a Seaſon, by reaſon of the Weakneſs of divers, and Reſpect many had unto them in the Churches Infancy. And tho' too many now are very formal and ſuperſtitious in thoſe outward Obſervations and Shadows, laying ſo much ſtreſs for Salvation upon them that they neglect the Subſtance; yet others being more conſcientiouſly tender in the obſervation thereof, we are the more tender to theſe, ſo as not to cenſure or condemn them meerly for practiſing that which they believe is their Duty, either in breaking of Bread or Water-Baptiſm, yet deſire they may ſee further, and come under that higher and evangelical Diſpenſation of the ſpiritual Communion and Bread of Life, and Cup of Bleſſing from Heaven (which can only nouriſh the Soul unto eternal Life) and of the ſpiritual Baptiſm of Chriſt, which only is the Soul's ſanctifying and ſaving Baptiſm; ſo that this *One Baptiſm* and this *One Bread*, which is the Subſtance, they may livingly partake of unto eternal Life.

We

We do hitherto want Proof that *Paul* either received of the Lord the Bread and the Cup, or the real Supper of the Lord in the Figure or Type (but the Myſtery thereof;) or that to obſerve the Figure was an Inſtitution of Chriſt to continue in the ſpiritual Church: And tho' he fulfilled the Command of the Paſſover at his Supper, we have no reaſon to think that was his own Inſtitution to continue in the Chriſtian Church, no more than the Paſſover, Legal Offerings, Circumciſion, &c. We confeſs, *That the neglect and abuſe of the Holy Myſtery*, p. 207. (which is the Subſtance, Chriſt the living Bread) *did and doth incur Damnation and grievous Diſeaſes*, as among the *Corinthians*; *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning he Lord's Body*, 1 Cor. 11. 29. If you reſt or ſtick in the Shadow, and neglect the Subſtance or Myſtery, ſo as you diſcern not the Lord's Body, you diſcern not that whereby your Souls ſhould live and be nouriſhed unto eternal Life: 'Tis Matter of Condemnation, you are but eating and drinking Damnation to your ſelves. The main end and drift of the Apoſtles labouring with and writing to them at *Corinth*, was to bring them to Life and Subſtance to the ſpiritual Rock, the ſpiritual Meat and Drink, which is Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 10. 14, 15,

16, 17. & 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. that they might be blameleſs in his Day; which 'tis evident the outward Figure or Shadow did not bring them to, but they were blameable, and blamed for the Carnality, Diviſions and Diſorders which were among them, 1 *Cor.* 3. 1, 3.

Now as to the outward Supper, ſo little being ſaid for it by our Oppoſer, we are not willing to enlarge or enter into any ſtrict Controverſie about that Subject; but for further Explanation, refer him to what our deceaſed Friend *Robert Barclay* has writ upon it, in his *Apology*, from p. 493 to p. 514. And if we were convinced that it is our Duty to receive Bread and Wine as an outward Memorial of Chriſt's Death, we ſhould never own this our Accuſer (who has ſhamefully reproached us) or any ſuch Enemies, to be our Adminiſtrators, nor hold Communion with them.

For Baptiſm, he alledges *Mat.* 28. 20. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them.*——— And here the Man breaks, leaving out, *In the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*; and then brings in, *And lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World*: Taking it for granted, that this Commiſſion muſt intend *Water Baptiſm*; and the continuance thereof, as well as Teaching or Preaching, even unto the *End* of the World.

Hence

Hence ſaying, *They (i. e.* Chriſt's miniſterial Officers) *indeed were impowered, as* John, *to baptize with Water*, p. 205. But is this Adverſary really for *John*'s Baptiſm, or for baptizing as *John* did? He's not expreſs nor plain in this Point. Tho' he would ſeem an eminent Advocate for the Church of *England*, we may greatly queſtion his Sincerity herein. If under this Pretext he means Infants Baptiſm, or Sprinkling them, he ſhould not take up the Anabaptiſt's Arguments for that which they oppoſe as a *ſcripture-leſs Thing*, and at the ſame time deem them *Schiſmaticks*, *Enthuſiaſts*, and number them among the *various Sects ſet up by* Rome, *under univerſal Tolleration*, as before, p. 17, 18. 2d Part. He's very diſingenuous in this as well as in many other Things: He ſhould have plainly told us what Baptiſm he aims at; and who the Subjects of it, whether Infants or Believers; before he had either upbraided or threatned us for the neglect of it.

However, pray obſerve the great Streſs he lays upon this *outward Baptiſm with Water*, viz. *That it was an Ordinance inſtituted as a means of Grace, whereby the inward Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt was conveyed; therefore the Form appointed, of admiſſion into the Society of the Church, and thereby giving a Title to all the Privileges and Promiſes annexed to it*, p. 206. *whereby Perſons are daily baptized into*

Christ's death, p. 209. And tells us of *Outward Signs and Seals*, *Pledges and Means of Grace*, which he judges the *Enemy has deluded Men into a neglect of*.

Now observe, 1. He makes Water-Baptism (whether of Infants or Believers he resolves not) not only an Institution, but a Means of Grace, whereby the inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost is conveyed.

2. Such a Form appointed of admission into the Church, as giveth a Title to all the Privileges and Promises, *&c.*

3. That 'tis the Baptism into Christ's Death.

4. A Seal, Pledge and Means of Grace.

In all which he does but upon his own Authority impose upon the Reader, without Scripture-proof: And his Impositions herein are liable to many Exceptions.

1. They suppose all Persons under Grace and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, who are come under Water-Baptism, without Exception of Infants or others; when the contrary is evident in many wicked Persons, and even in *Simon Magus* the Sorcerer, who was baptized and yet wicked; and wanting the Gift and Baptism of the Holy Ghost, would have bought it for Mony, *Acts* 8.

2. It

2. It alſo ſuppoſes all to be void of Grace, and of the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the Promiſes, who are not baptized with Water; conſequently, that many thouſands are Damned becauſe they are not ſo baptized: Which is highly uncharitable.

3. We deny that by Water-Baptiſm Men are baptized either into Chriſt's Death, Body or Church; or that 'tis a Seal or Pledge of Grace: For 'tis by one Spirit that true Believers are baptized unto Chriſt, and into Chriſt's Death, and into One Body; there being One Faith and One Baptiſm, which is that of the Spirit's, which is the Soul's ſaving Baptiſm, typified by that of Water. See 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Epheſ.* 4. 5. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

In the next place we may obſerve, this cenſorious, uncharitable Man will not allow Chriſt's Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28 19. *To intend ſpiritual Baptiſm, or the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt*; becauſe he ſaith, *Chriſt only is he who could baptize with the Holy Ghoſt. To ſay that Man could beſtow God (which the Holy Ghoſt is) is the higheſt Blaſphemy*, p. 203, 204.

And further to aggravate the Matter againſt us, he ſaith, *If the Quakers Interpretation of* Mat. 28. 19. *do hold, it will follow that the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors, have*

power to baptize with the Holy Ghoſt; which is Blaſphemy.

Reply, He is highly miſtaken in his ſuperlative Charge of Blaſphemy in this Caſe; for if our Interpretation of the Text does hold, That Chriſt's Apoſtles and Miniſters had Power given them by him (being preſent with them even in his own Work) to baptize with the Spirit, as well as to convert Men to God; then our Interpretation is not Blaſphemy, becauſe it holds. This ſevere Judge againſt us is quite out here: For tho' Chriſt be the great and efficient Cauſe both of giving and baptizing with the Spirit, yet his true Miniſters, who were indued with his divine Power, were inſtrumental in his Work of baptizing with the Spirit, yea, and of miniſtring the Spirit, and he was with them in his own Work; *Lo, I am with you always to the end of the World*, ſaith he; What for? *To enable them to baptize with Water*. No, that many can do without him, or the leaſt ſenſe of his Preſence; but lo Chriſt was with them to impower them to *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*. It is not *Go teach, and then baptize them with Water*; but *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them*, &c. There was a divine and ſpiritual Baptiſm, immediately attending (and preſent with) their Miniſtry,

(and

(and it was to ſuch as were docible too, and not to Infants who are not capable of Teaching;) and this ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt and his Baptiſm, accompanying their Miniſtry, is evident according to St. *Peter*'s own Relation, *Acts* 11. 15, 16. *And AS I began to ſpeak, the Holy Ghoſt fell on them that heard, even as upon us at the beginning. Then I remembred the Word of the Lord, how he ſaid, John baptized with Water, but ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt.* What's more plain, than that here was Teaching and Baptizing with the Holy Ghoſt, accompanying his Miniſtry?

Query, But were Chriſt's Apoſtles inſtrumental in miniſtring the Spirit? Yes, they being Miniſters of the Spirit, and not of the Letter. See *Gal.* 3. 2. *Received ye the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith preached?* And ver. 5. *He therefore that miniſtreth to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you, doth he it through the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith preached?* Their Speech and Preaching being not in the enticing Words of Man's Wiſdom, but in plain Evidence of the Spirit and of Power, that the Faith of the Hearers might not ſtand in the Wiſdom of Men, but in the Power of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 4, 5. *For* (ſaid he) *our Goſpel was not unto you in Word only, but alſo in Power, and in the Holy Ghoſt, and in much*

much Assurance, 1 Thes. 1. 5. But contrarywise, this imposing *Judge* has promoted Water-Baptism above the spiritual, powerful Ministry of the Gospel. *He'll have the spiritual Baptism to go along with that of Water, duly administred and received* (as he saith p. 205.) But by no means will he allow the spiritual Baptism to go along with the Gospel Ministry or Teaching, as commanded *Mat.* 28. 19. No by no means, that he deems *Blasphemy*; which bewrays his no small Ignorance both of the Scriptures and of the Power of God and true Gospel-Ministry in this case; and therefore he'll not allow *Inward Baptism* to *supersede the Outward*: Though *John Baptist*, who had a peculiar Commission for the Outward, allowed it, he preferred and exalted Christ's Baptism above his own, saying, *He must increase, but I must decrease*, John 3. 30. *I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance*, (or amendment of Life) *but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose Shoes I am not worthy to bear; he will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire*, Mat. 3. 11. Mark 1. 8. Luke 3. 16. John 1. 26, 27.

That *John* as to this his outward Ministry of Baptism should *decrease*, implies not an immediate or present end thereof, upon the entrance of Christ's Dispensation or Baptism, but that *John*'s should gradually de-

crease

creaſe and wear out as Chriſt's Miniſtry and Baptiſm do encreaſe and grow, as the Heat of Fire or Sun dries up the Water, and cauſes it to decreaſe by Degrees, and not ſuddenly all at once. For *John* and his Miniſtry being of great eſteem with many both Jews and Greeks (no doubt) his Baptiſm was condeſcended unto and allowed, when the Apoſtles were gathering divers of the Churches of Chriſt to a higher Miniſtry. And that this of *John*'s Baptiſm was an Act of Condeſcention and not of Commiſſion to the Apoſtles, *Paul* is very plain in this caſe, 1 *Cor.* 1. 14, 15, 16. after he ſaith, *I thank God that I baptized none of you, but* Criſpus *and* Gaius, *leſt any ſhould ſay that I had baptized in my own Name. I baptized alſo the Houſhold of* Stephanus, *&c.* He gives a more general Reaſon for his thanking God he baptized no more, *ver.* 17. *For Chriſt ſent me* NOT *to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel*, &c. And doubtleſs *Paul*'s Commiſſion from Chriſt was as large and extenſive as any of the Apoſtles had; therefore their Commiſſion in *Mat.* 28. 19 was not to baptize with Water, but with the Spirit, wherein their Goſpel Miniſtry came.

His ſuppoſing that *If the inward Baptiſm muſt ſuperſede the Outward, then muſt Inward Teaching*, p. 203. This ſuppoſes the outward Baptiſm of equal Authority with

Teach-

Teaching or Preaching the Gospel, and as necessary to continue, which we do not believe; yet we deny not but the inward and immediate Teaching of the *Holy Spirit* is more excellent and permanent than the Outward, as the Holy Spirit is the Original and Spring from whence the true outward Ministry arises and flows, and unto which it leads; and the more People come to know an Introversion and joining of their Minds to the Inward, the less need they'll have of the Outward, though we bless God for both.

But how proves this Adversary, *That the visible Representation of the Lord's death, by the Bread broken and the Wine poured forth, and also Water-Baptism, are the Body or outward part of Religion which* (he saith) *the Devil has stolen from us; so that the Soul soon disappeared, and left a noisome Carcass of Religion?* p. 209, 210.

What a strange, confused Whimsie is this? How has the Devil stolen from them the Body of Religion, and left a noisome Carcass behind? 'Tis more likely that he has stolen away the Soul of Religion from them, or rather their Minds from it; and left them only a Carcass behind, who are so much doting about and even idolizing the Shadow (which is far short of the Body of true Religion) and neglecting the Life, Soul and Sub-

Substance thereof; so that their outward Observations are dead, empty and fruitless, as those Observers are who are void of Christian Humility, Love or Charity.

Those repeated known Falshoods, 1. *That Christ's outward dying and shedding of his Blood, many of the Quakers have turn'd to mean nothing but his spiritual Suffering within us,* &c.

2. *To spiritualize AWAY the literal Humanity and Sufferings of Christ,* p. 208, 209. These Falshoods being fully answer'd and denied by us already, we need but persist in our Negation thereof.

To conclude this Head of Baptism with an Argument or two from the Terms of the Commission, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.*

Arg. 1. If the Commission intended baptizing them with Water, then the Apostles must have followed and used the Terms of the Commission in the Execution thereof, to manifest their Authority for it.

But they did not follow nor use the Terms of the Commission in baptizing with Water; therefore, that Baptism was not intended in the Commission.

The first part of the Argument is undeniable, from the Sanction and Authority of the Commission it self, which is expresly,

Go

Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in (or *into*) *the Name of the Father, and of the Son and Holy Ghoſt.*

The ſecond part of the Argument is prov'd by the following.

Arg. 2. Chriſt's Apoſtles and Miniſters did Teach and Preach in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt; but they did not Baptize with Water in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt;

Therefore baptizing with Water was not intended in that Commiſſion.

The ſecond Propoſition is proved by their baptizing only in the Name of the Lord, or in the Name of the Lord Jeſus, when they baptized with Water as *John* did.

We do not find in all the *Acts* or other Scripture, that the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, were uſed by any of the Apoſtles of Chriſt in baptizing with Water. Let him peruſe *W. DELL's* Βαπτισμῶν Διδαχὴ, *Or, The Doctrin of Baptiſms*; and *T. Lawſon's* Βαπτισμολογία, *Or, A Treatiſe concerning Baptiſms: Whereunto is added, A Diſcourſe concerning the Supper, Bread and Wine, called the Communion.*

To his 15th Sect. *Concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt.*

Herein

Herein (he ſaith) *the Quakers are direct* Socinians; *for they poſitively deny the Satisfaction.*

Here he ſtumbles at the Threſhold again; this is a poſitive Untruth in Fact. They are neither *Socinians*, nor do they deny the Satisfaction of Chriſt it ſelf; for God was ever well pleaſed and ſo ſatisfied in his dear, innocent Son, but never with Sinners continuing in their Sins. That therefore which we deny, is the *Unſcriptural*, *Sin-pleaſing* and *Sinner-ſoothing Notions* of our former Adverſaries about it, as that of Chriſt ſuffering under *Vindictive Juſtice*, from the Father, and making ſuch a *rigid* and ſtrict Satisfaction and Payment in our Stead; thereby to acquit and juſtifie the guilty Offender, though perſiſting in Sin all his Days. This Notion of Satisfaction, as ſeverely and rigidly ſtated, as vindictive upon the dear Son of God, and thus indulging to Sinners, both the Quakers, and even a Biſhop of the Church of *England*, have oppoſed.

'Tis alſo ſuch a Notion of a *rigid Satisfaction* and ſtrict Payment, held as a *Notion of Law*, in the ſtricteſt and ſevereſt Senſe, that *W. P.* oppoſeth God's Compaſſion unto, *in pardoning Iniquity, paſſing by Tranſgreſſion and Sin, and forgiving our Treſpaſſes* (which we ever own to be for Chriſt's ſake, but upon true Faith and Repentance) from

theſe

theſe Scriptures, *Mica* 7. 18. *Mat.* 6. 12, 14. & ch. 18.

Therefore this Adverſary miſtakes and miſrepreſents *W. P.* in this Point, as *blaſphemng* and arguing againſt the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, p. 212, 213. when he argues againſt that kind of Satisfaction held *(as a rigid Notion of Law)* that admits not of Forgiveneſs of Sins paſt; which we conſeſs Chriſt's Sufferings and Sacrifice has made way for, upon true Repentance on the Offenders part, which Chriſt's great Sufferings (under the Burthen of the World's Iniquities) do call for, and require univerſally of them.

And as to the Praiſe of the great Love and Grace of God to Mankind, we muſt confeſs, that it was by the ſame Grace Chriſt taſted Death for every Man, and was really an Offering and a Sacrifice of a ſweet ſmelling Savour to God, *Epheſ.* 5. 2. and our only Mediator; and in that Senſe ſincerely own what was really his Satisfaction to the Father, to ſtay the Execution of his Wrath and obtain our Pardon, giving us Repentance by his Light and Grace in our Hearts, yet ſuch a kind of *rigid Satisfaction* and ſtrict Payment to *vindictive or revenging Juſtice*, as if God poured out his juſt Indignation or Wrath (merited by Sinners) upon his innocent Son (as ſome of our Adverſaries have

have affirmed no leſs.) This we confeſs we cannot reconcile either to God's divine Juſtice or Mercy, or to Chriſt's Mediation and Interceſſion for Tranſgreſſors. And little ſhort of this, is our preſent Adverſary's Notion, *That Juſtice cannot remit the leaſt Farthing, elſe it were not Juſtice*; ſpeaking of *divine Juſtice* even of *God*, as being *not only juſt, but Juſtice it ſelf in the Abſtract, the higheſt and moſt adequate Notion of Juſtice*, p. 214. All which duly conſidered, borders upon the moſt *rigid* and *extream* Notion of Satisfaction; as if divine Juſtice (*i. e.* God himſelf in his Senſe) could not remit the leaſt Farthing, but Chriſt muſt ſtrictly pay every Farthing of the Debt of Offenders; whereas there is a divine Juſtice or Righteouſneſs (that's truly Evangelical) which is declared in the Forgiveneſs of Sins that are paſt, through the forbearance of God, *Rom.* 3. 25. and ver. 26. to ſhew at this time his Righteouſneſs; that he might be Juſt, and the Juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus. It was for this end that God ſet forth his Son Jeſus Chriſt, to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare his *Righteouſneſs* for *the remiſſion of Sins paſt*, &c. Wherefore the Quakers do not make *one of God's Attributes fight with or conquer the other*, nor *one to ſubdue and beat down the other*; or *his Juſtice to quit the Field*

to his Mercy; as is ignorantly and unjustly suggested, to make us guilty of great *Nonsense and Blasphemy*, p. 214, 215, 216. For all God's Attributes in himself are in Concord, Union and Harmony; and in his Creatures concur and agree, in order to its Reconcilation to himself; as when he brings Man to taste of his Justice and Displeasure for Sin, it's still in Mercy, to humble him by his Chastisement and Judgment unto Repentance, that he may find Mercy, so as Judgment and Mercy may meet in the same Soul. And God's Wisdom is truly magnified in finding out the means of our Redemption, by *our great and only Mediator Jesus Christ*, through his Mediation, Suffering, Sacrifice and Attonement; and his Goodness and Mercy are equally magnified, in affording those means: But this proves not that *adequate Satisfaction* to *vindictive Justice*, which our Adversaries have contended for.

And tho' we sincerely own Jesus Christ as we ought to do, both for our Example, Intercessor, Light and Teacher; yet this is not all our Notion, or rather Knowledge, wherein we receive him; neither do we in these, deny the necessity of his Death, or *exclude* any *rational* account thereof, as is unduly supposed, p. 216. For there was great reason for Christ's Death and Sacri-

fice

fice for Sinners (becauſe all in *Adam* were dead and under Condemnation) that they might live by and unto him, ſo as to be truly capable of really knowing and owning *Chriſt Jeſus, in Spirit, Life and Power*; and in all his Offices and Works, both as King, High prieſt and Prophet, our great Mediator, Example, Captain, Leader, Light and Law-giver.

But to draw towards a Concluſion of this point of *Satisfaction*, ſeeing 'tis ſo numbly and impertinently ſtated by our preſent Antagoniſt, let us obſerve a little further how rigidly and ſeverely he ſtates it, to the Diſhonour of God, divine Juſtice it ſelf, and his beloved Son. He firſt puts the Queſtion.

What room then is there for God's Mercy? If he be all Juſtice, where is his Mercy? Then he Anſwers: *God's Attributes do not fight or contradict one another, they magnifie and exalt one another.* (True thus far; but how?) *Thus God's Juſtice is magnified, in that it exacts full and* adequate *Satisfaction, paid to God's Juſtice for our Sins, in the Sacrifice and Death of Chriſt; which becauſe of his divine Nature, was full and* adequate *Satisfaction. And by his humane Nature, the Satisfaction was paid by the ſame Nature, which offended*, p. 214, 215.

All which considered, this is to assert Satisfaction as a *Notion of Law* (as Dr. *Owen* call'd it) in the highest, rigid and most severe Sense exacted, that any of the *Prebyterians*, &c. have asserted it. And to save us the Labour of drawing the Consequences and Answers here, we may here (I hope without Offence) give him a Recitation of a more ingenuous Person's Answer (and Objection against this Notion) than himself, namely, Dr. *Stilling fleet*, (since Bishop of *Worcester*) in his *Discourse concerning the true Reason of the Sufferings of Christ*; pages 269, 270. Printed 1669. Out of which take the following Discourse, *viz.*

'The state of the Controversy hath been 'rendred more obscure by the Mistakes of 'some, who have managed it with greater 'Zeal than Judgment; they have shot over 'their Adversary's Heads, and laid their 'own more open to Assaults. It is easie to 'observe, That most of *Socinus* his Arguments are levelled against an Opinion, 'which few who have considered those 'things do maintain, and none need to 'think themselves obliged to do it; which 'is, *That Christ paid a proper and rigid Satisfaction for the Sins of Men, considered under the Notion of Debts, and that he paid the very same which we ought to have done*;

'which

'which in the Senſe of the Law is never
'called *Satisfaction*, but *ſtrict Payment*.
'Againſt this *Socinus* diſputes, from the
'impoſſibility of Chriſt's paying the very
'ſame that we were to have paid, becauſe
'our Penalty was eternal Death. And that
'as the conſequence of *inherent Guilt*, which
'Chriſt neither did nor could undergo. If
'a *Mediator* could have paid the ſame, then
'the Goſpel had not been the bringing in
'of a better Covenant, but a performance
'of the old, p. 271. But if there be a
'*Relaxation* or *Diſpenſation* of the firſt Law,
'then it neceſſarily follows, that what
'Chriſt paid was not the very ſame which
'the firſt Law required; for what need of
'that, when the very ſame was paid that
'was in the Obligation? But if it be ſaid,
'That the *Dignity* of the Perſon makes up
'what wanted in the kind or degree of Pu-
'niſhment; this is a plain Confeſſion, that
'it is not the ſame, *&c.* Beſides, if the
'very ſame had been paid in the ſtrict Senſe,
'there would have followed *A Deliverance*,
'*ipſo facto*, for the Releaſe immediately
'follows the Payment of the ſame; and it
'had been Injuſtice to have required any
'thing further in order to the Diſcharge of
'the Offender, when ſtrict and full Pay-
'ment had been made of what was in the
'Obligation. But we ſee that *Faith and*

'*Repentance*, and the Conſequences of thoſe
'Two are made Conditions on our parts,
'in order to the enjoying the *Benefit* of
'what Chriſt hath procured, ſo that the
'Releaſe is not immediate upon the Pay-
'ment, *&c.*

P. 272. 'We are to conſider that theſe
'very Perſons aſſert, *That Chriſt paid all*
'*for us, and in our Name and Stead*, ſo that
'the *Payment* by Chriſt was by a *Subſtitution*
'*in our room:* And if he paid the ſame
'which the Law required, the Benefit muſt
'immediately accrue to thoſe in whoſe
'Name the Debt was paid; for what was
'done in the Name of another, is all one to
'the Creditor as if it had been done by the
'Debtor himſelf. But above all things it is
'impoſſible to reconcile the *freeneſs of Re-*
'*miſſion* with the *full Payment*, &c. Neither
'will it ſerve to ſay, *That though it was not*
'*free to Chriſt, yet it was to us*, for the *Sa-*
'*tisfaction* and *Remiſſion* muſt reſpect the
'ſame Perſon; for Chriſt did not pay for
'himſelf, but for us; neither could the Re-
'miſſion be to him, *&c.* It is impoſſible
'the ſame Debt ſhould be *fully* paid and
'*freely forgiven*, much leſs will it avoid the
'Difficulty in this Caſe to ſay, *That it was a*
'*refuſable Payment*; for it being ſuppoſed
'to be the very ſame, it was not in Juſtice
'refuſable, *&c.* p. 173. But this whole

'Opi-

'Opinion is built upon a Miſtake, *That* '*Satisfaction muſt be the Payment of the very* '*ſame*; which while they contend for, they 'give our Adverſaries too great advantage, 'and make them think they triumph over 'the Faith of the Church, when they do it 'only over the Miſtake of ſome particular 'Perſons. But the Foundation of this Mi-'ſtake lies in the Conſideration of *Puniſh-'ment*, under the Notion of *Debts*; and '*That Satisfaction therefore muſt be by ſtrict* '*Payment in Rigor of Law.* But how great 'that Miſtake is, will appear in the ſubſe-'quent Diſcourſe. Thus far the Citation.

The ſubſequent Diſcourſe he mentions, is from p. 273, 274. to the end of the ſaid *Diſcourſe of the Sufferings of Chriſt*.

Now I would adviſe our Accuſer to compare his Notion of a *full and adequate Satisfaction paid to God's Juſtice* (which he has told us cannot remit the leaſt Farthing) with the aforeſaid Diſcourſe, and then ſee how he'll reconcile his Notion thereunto.

In Sect. 16. *Concerning the Holy Trinity*, he ſaith:

The Quakers *and* Socinians *acknowledge a Three, but deny a Trinity; which is to confeſs*

the ſame Thing in Engliſh, and to deny it in Latin; for Trinitas *is only Latin for* Three.

He miſtakes the Quakers: They do not deny the *Three* either in Latin or Engliſh, but really own the *holy, divine Three* in Heaven; tho' their being rendred *diſtinct and ſeparate Perſons*, by ſome of our former Adverſaries, we have conſcientiouſly queſtioned, as unſcriptural Terms.

Our Adverſary adds, *They cannot tell what Three they are, if not Three Perſons*, p. 219. This is a Miſtake; we can ſafely tell what to call them in Scripture Language: That they are Three that bear Record, or Three witneſſing, τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες, (i. e. *Witneſſes*) in Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One, *John* 1. 5. Theſe are the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which are eſſentially One, or One in the Divine Being.

Our Adverſary further ſaith: *The Quakers, who own the Divinity of Chriſt, are under greater Difficulties than the* Socinians, *who deny the Divinity of Chriſt*, p. 219.

'Tis well he now grants the Quakers own the Divinity of Chriſt: But how well this agrees with much of his Book againſt us, let the ſerious Reader judge. And we know no Difficulties we are under herein: The Man imagins, and would obtrude Difficulties upon us, from his own Terms, which

are

are none of ours; as that *there is but One Perſon in the Godhead*; which are none of our Words. Much leſs his *Muggletonian* Conſequence, *That God died, and that Chriſt was his own Father to whom he pray'd upon the Croſs.* We know no real occaſion given by the Quakers, for him to draw ſuch Abſurdities upon them, or to be *afraid of ſuch Diſtinctions and Salvo's at the bottom of the Quaker-pretences*, as impertinently he prates againſt them, expoſing his pretended Fears inſtead of Proofs.

And what if *G. F.* oppoſed *Chr. Wade*'s calling *The Holy Ghoſt a Perſon?* And if he ſaid, The Scriptures do not tell the People of *Three Perſons*, &c? And yet confeſſing the *Father*, *Son and Holy Spirit to be always One?* Does it follow, That the Quakers do not acknowledge that there were *Three in Heaven before Chriſt was born*, *as* (he ſaith) *it ſeems?* p. 220. And then to aggravate the Matter againſt *G. F. That he means One Perſon*, *as* Muggleton *does*, p. 220.

What if the Quakers think the Term *Three Perſons*, too low an Epithite or Character to put upon the moſt Glorious, Bleſſed *Three* that bear Record in Heaven? Can they be to blame herein? When they aim at giving more Honour to them, in a true Scripture-ſenſe, than they think the Term *Perſons* imports, yet ſtill owning the

Holy

Holy, Divine Three in Heaven, and that they were before Chriſt was born; contrary to what's unduly ſuggeſted againſt us. For the Father, the Word and Holy Spirit, were concerned both in Divine Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs, in forming, preſerving and governing both the Old Creation and the New; *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them by the Spirit of his Mouth*, Pſal. 33. 6. So here's the Divine, Holy Three forming and compleating the firſt Creation. And the Goſpel was commanded to be preached in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, that Men might truly believe and know the Work of God by his dear Son and Holy Spirit, unto their everlaſting Salvation, Peace and Comfort. *For God ſo loved the World, that he hath given his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life*, John 3. 16. *And Jeſus anſwered and ſaid, If any Man love me he will keep my Word, and my Father will love him; and we will come unto him, and will dwell with him*, John 14. 23. And ver. 26. *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my Name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, which I have told you.* And Ch. 15. 26. *But when the Comforter ſhall come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the*

Spirit

Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth of the Father, he ſhall teſtifie of me.

And 1 *Joh.* 4. 13, 14. *Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, becauſe he hath given us of his Spirit. And we have ſeen and do teſtifie, That the Father ſent the Son to be the Saviour of the World.* All which may evince how ſcripturally we own a *Trinity*, or *Holy Three* in the Deity.

Our Accuſer tells of *what unimaginable Exceſſes Enthuſiaſm may drive Men to; and that all ſhould beware of that deſperate Shelve, upon which both our Church and State have ſuffered miſerable Shipwreck*, p. 221, 222. Here he diſparages his own Church, whereby we may beware of embarking in ſuch a craz'd, wreck'd Veſſel, as here he repreſents her.

He excepts againſt the Words *not diſtinct*, from which *G. F.* intends, in a ſort of common Acceptation, *That the Son is not divided or ſeparate from the Father*, p. 222, 223, 224. Tho' 'tis true in one Senſe, the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are not eſſentially diſtinct as to their divine Being, which is but *One*, they are but One God; but in reſpect to their Properties of Relation, as Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, as ſuch they are diſtinct; but not divided nor ſeparate, either in themſelves or Work of the Old or New Creation; yet not Three Gods, nor Three

diſtinct

distinct Creators, but One God, and One Creator.

Passing by divers Impertinencies and Absurdities under this Head, to conclude, We know no People professing a Deity in *Christendom*, that more sincerely and livingly believe and confess a most-glorious *Scripture-Trinity* (or Holy Three) the Father, the Word (or Son) and Holy Ghost, than we the People called Quakers do believe and confess; to the Praise and Glory of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Our Accuser's 17th Sect. *Concerning the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ*, is full of Falsehoods, Perversions and Misconstructions.

1. He begins with this Falshood, *viz. The Quakers Heresie in this is taken from the* Socinians: *They say, Christ took Flesh; but no otherwise, as they explain it, than as Angels assumed Bodies*, &c. Which is notoriously false against the Quakers, who confess and believe, That Christ, the Word, took real Flesh, a real Body, and not a meer Apparition, nor a Fantastical Body; and so they have often declared both in Print and Preaching.

2. *That they allow (not always) that Christ did inspire the Person of that Man Jesus, in an higher measure than other Men.* False and per-

perverſe again: God did inſpire the Man Chriſt Jeſus higher than all other Men; he received the Spirit not by meaſure, but in fulneſs; he was anointed with the Oil of Gladneſs above all his Fellows: All other Men, even the beſt, are inſpired only meaſurably. This is always allowed by us.

3. Falſe again, *That they deny any proper Incarnation of Chriſt; that is, that he was made Fleſh.* For the Word was made Fleſh, *John* 1. 14. And he took not upon him the Nature of Angels, but the Seed of *Abraham*, and part of the ſame Fleſh and Blood which the Children had, *Heb.* 2. 14, 16. and Chriſt Jeſus is one entire Chriſt and Saviour. We do not divide nor confound Jeſus and Chriſt, nor take the Name *Chriſt* to our ſelves, but *Chriſtians*, as anointed by him, and Partakers of Chriſt, and only ſo far have an Intereſt in his Name, Power and Life.

4. Falſe alſo, *That they ſay not that Chriſt did carry up* (i. e. *the Body of Jeſus*) *with him into Heaven.* Whoſe Body then but his own, when he was viſibly ſeen to aſcend, ſo as a Cloud received him out of their ſight? *Acts* 1. 9, 10, 11.

5. Seeing we confeſs, That Chriſt is now in Heaven; when did ever we *refuſe to confeſs, that there is any Jeſus now in Heaven, or*

any

any elsewhere? This is an absurd Accusation, as if we divided Jesus and Christ, or denied Jesus to be Christ; which is far from us.

6. *That they know not what's become of him,* (Jesus) is also false. He ascended far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things; and we know him in us by his Spirit.

7. *That they say there's no Christ without them,* is false also.

8. *No other Christ but what's within them.* There's not Two Christs: 'Tis one and the same Christ that is without us and within us, tho' in different manners.

9. *That they allow him no other Body but their own;* is false. They allow him his own proper glorious Body, in which he is their Head, and they united to him; so as the Body (in general or comprehensively) is but one Body, even so is Christ, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12.

10. *That they spiritualize ALL his Life and Death to his spiritual Living and Dying within them;* which is a reiterated Falsehood. The same Christ that was crucified in the Flesh without, is spiritually within known in true Believers: 'Tis not another Christ, but another Manifestation of one and the same Christ.

11. Our

11. Our Friend *G. F.* (in the places impertinently and perverſly quoted, *Gr. Myſt.* p. 210, 211, 254.) does not diſpute againſt ſaying, That the Man Chriſt that was crucified, his Body is now in the Preſence of his Father: But againſt their ſaying, *Chriſt is abſent from the Saints and People*; and againſt their profeſſing *a Chriſt without them and another within them*, (i. e. Two Chriſts) *There being but one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 8. 6.

12. 'Tis neither *impious nor blaſphemous* in the Quakers to affirm, That the One Lord Jeſus Chriſt does *influence, inſpire and enlighten us by his Life and Spirit in our Hearts*, (this is the true ſtate of the Caſe) *to guide us; and that he is the only Chriſt and Saviour that ſo doth; and that Chriſt, and his Spirit and Light, are not ſo divided*: Being ſtill but One Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who ſuffered for us, and reigneth both in Heaven and Earth, in which he hath all Power committed to him.

13. Our Adverſary refers to one *Rob. Gordon's* Authority againſt us, in his pretended *Teſtimony to the true Saviour, or Jeſus of Nazareth*, printed 1670. In which there are many Abuſes, Miſrepreſentations and Contradictions anſwered and detected by *G. Keith* and *G. Whitehead*, in their Book, Entituled, *The Light of Truth triumphing*

over

over Darkneſs, Ignorance, Error and Envy. *G. Keith* then vindicated us and our Principles againſt *R. G.* and other Oppoſers; however he be now declined and turned againſt us, he has not retracted his Anſwer to the ſaid *R. Gordon*, whoſe Authority we deny, and it will not ſupport our preſent Oppoſer againſt us.

14. What he quotes of *S. E.*'s Challenge, *What was ſaid of Chriſt, the World was made by him, and the World knew him not, ſo it may be ſaid of this true Prophet* G. F. p. 232. We the Quakers, ſo called, diſown the Compariſon, any otherwiſe than as it relates to *the World knew him not*, for ſo far Chriſt himſelf allows his own, *They are not of the World, as I am not of the World*, John 17. *And the World knoweth you not, becauſe it knoweth not him*, 1 John 3. 1.

15. *His repeated falſe Charges of making our ſelves equal with God, and preferring our ſelves before the Man Chriſt, making him and all he did and ſuffered to be* BUT *a Type or Shadow of what is really performed in us by the true Chriſt*, p. 233. Theſe Falſhoods and Perverſions are anſwered, denied and detected, partly before in this, and in our *Juſt Enquiry*, and alſo in an Anſwer to Dr. *Ford*, Entituled, *The Chriſtianity of the People commonly called Quakers*, &c.

Some

Some of his other Falſhoods he quotes and credits out of *R. Gordon*, are *viz.*

16. Crying up a Light within, *to cry down the Blood without.*

17. To preach him (Chriſt) as an Example, *to caſt out the Attonement.*

18. *Denying him to have any real, outward, individual, glorified, bodily Exiſtence in his Fathers Kingdom.*

19. *That the preaching of a Chriſt without them, they call old beggarly Stuff.* Adding *viz.*

20. *And thoſe who formerly preacht him as without us (though Prophets or Apoſtles) to be low and carnal in their Day, according to their Cant, which he there repeats*, p. 235.

Theſe foul and odious Lies, Calumnies and Perverſions he credits and repeats againſt us, which we utterly deny (and his Authority alſo quoted by him) as malicious and injurious.

21. His next Authority againſt us is *T. C.* i. e. *Tho. Criſp* his *Animadverſ.* and *F. Bugg*'s *Quakeriſm Withering*; both which are fully anſwered, and their manifold Falſhoods and Calumnies juſtly detected and reprehended, particularly in *G. W.*'s Anſwer, Entituled, *The Counterfeit Convert*, and *T. C.* by *Edward Pennington.* As to thoſe offenſive Words *Your carnal Chriſt, your imagined God*, we do not affect the Terms, neither

are they proper to the true Christ, or omnipresent God.

22. In p. 236. the Snake unfairly cites *G. F.* in two places, *Gr. Myst.* p. 250. leaving out the very reason of his Reflection upon *Chr. Wade, his recording himself a Reprobate*, which was *his Ignorance of the Mystery of Christ within him.* And *Gr. Myst.* p. 183. "*The Imputation to a Believer is owned*, "and this Imputation is within; for he "that believes is born of God, and hath "the Witness in himself. *Abraham* be-"lieved and the *Romans*, and to such the "Imputation was spoken in the Belief, &c. All these Words left out (as seems to us) with design to render us as wholly denying *Imputation* on any account, which is a manifest Perversion; tho' *G. F.* in the place cited, esteems the *inward Enjoyment of Christ Jesus, and his Righteousness*, to be *beyond any Imputation only*, in the first Belief, as true Believers, in Union with Christ, are nearer to him than when they first believed.

23. 'Tis false, *That the Body which Christ assumed, we do not call the Body of Christ, as a Man's Body is called his Body; but only as when an Angel assumes a Body.* For the Body which Christ assumed was his real Body, and he really suffered in it; and therein was made a little lower than the Angels, *Heb.* 2 9. who were not capable of such Suffe-

rings

rings as his, yet he was dignified, crowned with Glory and Honour far above them.

24. Again the Snake perversly quotes, *F. Bugg's New Rome Arraign'd; That the Quakers can never call the bodily Garment, Christ*; thence inferring, *His Body to be but only as a Cloak or a Garment which a Man wears, which he may throw off or put on again without any alteration in his Person or Nature*, p. 237, 238. In this he perversly strains the Simily (a Man's Cloak has no feeling to suffer with him when he is bruised or wounded) and he is partial still, in not taking notice of the Answer to *F. Bugg* even in this very Point. See *Charitable Essay*, p. 2. thus given, *viz.*

" As to *J. P.*'s Words chiefly objected,
" *That we cannot call the Bodily Garment, Christ.*
" The word *Garment* I take to be only a
" figurative manner of speaking, as the
" word *Vail*, which is his Flesh is, *Heb.*
" 10. 20. An Ingenuous Man would allow
" him his own meaning as he explains it;
" namely, *That we cannot call the Body (which he took upon him)* Chiefly *and in the* First Place *Jesus Christ.* It not being first,
" nor the intire Christ, because he was the
" Son of God, and consequently Christ,
" before he took upon him that Body, even
" when God created all things by Jesus

 " Christ,

" Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 3. 9. He made the Worlds " *by* his Son, *Heb.* 1. 2.

And after ſeveral Arguments in p. 3, 4. proving the Divinity and Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt the Son of God, before he aſſumed the Body, the general Conſequence deduced from the Premiſes, is, " That the " Names Jeſus and Chriſt chiefly and pri- " marily belong to *Him* that took the " Body, though ſometimes given to each " and to both.

25. Falſe again, *That the Quakers ſay or make the Fleſh of Chriſt of an earthly, periſhing Nature*, p. 238. from *F. Bugg*'s, ſaying (againſt *J. P.*) *That which he* (Chriſt) *took upon him* (i. e. *his Body*) *was our Garment, even the Fleſh and Blood of our Nature, which IS of an earthly, periſhing Nature*; falſly adding, *and is periſhed by their Account*, p. 238. Thus from *Bugg*'s Authority and Citation againſt us; but takes no notice of the Anſwer in the ſaid *Charitable Eſſay*, p. 4. in theſe Words, *viz.*

" *He* (*i. e. F. B.* and now his Diſciple the Author of the *Snake*) " hath here noto- " riouſly wronged the People called Qua- " kers, by impoſing a falſe Creed upon " them. Where do they ſay, *That Chriſt's* " *Body either was or is of an earthly periſhing* " *Nature?* I utterly deny the Charge, and

F. B.

" *F. B.* alſo to be our Creed-maker, Con-
" ſtruer or Expoſitor, who hath unjuſtly
" inferr'd this upon us from *Iſ. Pennington*'s
" ſaying, *He took upon him the Fleſh and*
" *Blood of our Nature, which is of an earthly*
" *periſhing Nature.* Whereby neither he
" nor the Quakers ſay, That Chriſt's Body
" either *was* or *is* of an *earthly periſhing Na-*
" ture; for his Fleſh ſaw *no* Corruption,
" therefore did not periſh; tho' our Na-
" *ture*, our Fleſh and Blood be of an earthly
" periſhing Nature, *ſo* is not Chriſt's. I
" cannot rationally ſuppoſe that *F. P.* ever
" intended that Chriſt's Body (which on
" Earth did not corrupt) *is* of an earthly
" periſhing Nature now in Heaven as ours
" is now on Earth; (take his Words alſo
" Grammatically) for it is ſuch an abſurdity
" as I cannot think ever entred into *Iſ. Pen-*
" *nington*'s Heart, being a Man both of
" Learning, Senſe and Conſcience; [*The*
" *Fleſh and Blood of our Nature*] being ante-
" cedent next to [*which is of an earthly periſhing*
" *Nature*] Therefore [*periſhing*] appears
" only relative to *Fleſh and Blood*, as 'tis
" ours and in us, and not to Chriſt's Body
" which *is* incorruptible and glorious.

26. The People called Quakers neither *account that the Body of Chriſt periſhed, vaniſhed or was annihilated*, as ſaid, p. 238. but that

'twas changed so as to be a glorious, celestial Body.

27. 'Tis not true in his Sense, *That the Quakers think that the Name of Christ does belong to every one of them, not only more than to that Body now, but as well as to it while upon the Earth*; quoting *Bugg*'s *New Rome*. Again, *Doth not the Name Christ belong to the whole Body, and to every Member of the Body, as well as to the Head?* A Question, p. 27.

Thus one Adversary credits and promotes the Authority of another to reproach us, without taking notice of our full Answers already given. Oh! disingenuous, as in this very Point. In the said *Charitable Essay*, p. 4. in these Words, *viz.*

'Object. *Doth not the Name belong to the whole Body*, &c. *So that there are as many Christ's, by their Doctrin, as believing Quakers.*

'*Answ.* No, that's not our Doctrin; there's one Body, and so but one Christ, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. But turn the Question into *F. B.*'s contrary Doctrin implied, and then 'tis *The Name Christ belongs not to the whole Body, Christ's Body* (*i. e.* his Church) *is not Anointed; it therefore hath no right to his Name nor any Member thereof*; but then doth not this appear contrary to the Apostle's Doctrin, *viz. For as the Body is one and*

'*and hath many Members, and all the Mem-*
'*bers of the Body, which is one, though they be*
'*many, yet are but one Body; even ſo is Chriſt,*
'1 Cor. 12. 12. The Proteſtant Annota-
'tions in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Bible are, *That*
'*we might be one Body with Chriſt, and the*
'*whole Church one Chriſt.* And on *Epheſ.*
'1.23. *The Church is alſo called Chriſt*, 1 Cor.
'12. 12. (What ſays our Adverſary to
'theſe Annotations? Dare he judge them
'horrid Blaſphemy?) And he that eſtabli-
'ſheth us with you in Chriſt Jeſus, and hath
'χρίσας, *Anointed* us, is God, 2 *Cor.* 1.
'21.

'Queſt. *But doth not the Name belong to the*
'*whole Body (and to every Member therein) as*
'*well as to the Head?*

'*Anſw.* 1. Not Equally, becauſe he is the
'Head. 2. Not Literally to be ſo named,
'but vertually and ſpiritually (*i. e.* as by
'inward Participiation) and ſo *truly*, with
'reſpect to that divine Power and Spirit,
'whereby both the *Head* and the *Body* are
'Anointed (and united) and each Member
'partakes thereof in ſome meaſure. But
'Chriſt, the Head in all things, has the
'Preheminence, he was *Anointed* (more
'eminently) in Fulneſs, his Members in
'part or meaſure by the ſame Spirit and
'Power; he was *Anointed* above his
'Fellows, implying their being anointed

'in degree. Χριστὸς, *Christ*, signifies *Anoint-*
'*ed*, as being the *very Christ the only begotten*
'*Son of God*, which I know no Member of
'his Body assumes to himself; but Χριστιανὸς,
'*Christian*, which has relation to Christ the
'*Anointed*; for where Christ's Church,
'which is his Body, is said to be the *Fulness*
'of him that filleth all in all, *Ephes.* 1. 23.
'tis not of the Church as distinctly consi-
'dered from the Head; but (as in Union
'therewith) Christ the Head is included
'in that Fulness, tho' his proper Existence
'be entire, compleat and most glorious.
I think this Answer to *F. Bugg*, may fully Answer his Disciple the Author of the *Snake*.

28. From *G. Fox*'s saying, *Christ is the Elect*; our Adversary infers, *And the Elect are Christ, they make them convertible Terms*, p. 239. They are not so made by us nor by *G. F.* in the place quoted, *Gr. Myst.* p. 88. but the contrary; tho' there he saith, *Christ is the Elect whom God upholds*; He also saith, *Christ knows his, and said he had other Sheep, and he knew All the Elect; and who receive him and are in him, are the Elect*. There's no such Words in the place quoted as *that the Elect are Christ*. Thus the plain Scripture is perverted which *G. F.* refers to, *Isa.* 42. 1.

29. He

29. He again quotes *Gr. Myst.* p. 207. *That God's Christ is not distinct from his Saints.* Here the Man unfairly leaves out what follows, *viz. For he is within them, their Spirits witness him*, &c. Wherein 'tis plain, he means Christ is not *divided* or *separate* from his Saints. He takes *distinct from*, in a kind of common Acceptation, for *divided* or *separate from.* Here he cavils about Words or a Mode of speaking, and then draws his hard Consequences. As

30. *The grossest Absurdities, highest Blasphemies, and that* G. F. *could find no difference, no distinction at all betwixt Christ and himself:* Which appears a perverse and presumptuous Calumny. As doth the next,

31. *That All the divine Attributes should be given to* G. F. *as well as unto Christ; and that* G. F. *does assume the Stile and Names of Christ to himself*, &c. The Man here quoting his own Authority in his Sect. 5. and there *F. B.*'s, both which we deny. They have injuriously abused *G. F.* and others in this Matter, who neither calls himself *The Door that ever was, nor the same Christ yesterday, to day, and for ever*; (he speaks this of Christ, not of himself;) neither did the Quakers call him the *Branch*, the *Star*, &c. as *Bugg* and the *Snake* have basely aspersi him and others, Sect. 5. p. 41, 43. &c.

These

Theſe Calumnies and perverſe Abuſes are ſufficiently detected in ſeveral Anſwers to *F. Bugg*, and in *Juſt Enquiry into the Libeller's Abuſe*. And tho' we deny that thoſe divine Attributes given to Chriſt may be given to any mortal Man, yet divers Names given to Chriſt are given to Saints alſo; as the *Son of God*, the *Sons of God*, Luke 3. 28. John 1. 12. Rom. 8. 14. *The Light of the World*, John 8. 12. Mat. 5. 14. *The Salt of the Earth*, Mat. 5. 13. *The Righteouſneſs of God*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. 2 Cor. 5. 21. *Kings*, *Prieſts*, *Prophets*, *Apoſtles*, *Miniſters*, *The Seed*, *The Good Seed*, *Anointed*, *Elect*, given both to Chriſt and his faithful Followers. But it may be ſaid, Theſe are not all properly divine Attributes: However, they are ſuch as are given both to Chriſt, and his Brethren and Members the Saints, and true Followers of God: But *The Image and Glory of God*, I preſume will be aſſented to be no leſs than *divine Attributes*, or importing the ſame, and yet without Blaſphemy or Idolatry, Man (whoſe Head Chriſt is) is called *The Image and Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 7, and not in any Diſhonour to Chriſt, though the ſame Epithets or Characters do properly belong to him, *Heb.* 1. 3. 2 *Cor.* 4 4. *Col.* 1. 15. yet given alſo to Man, becauſe indued with (or participating of) God's Image in Chriſt Jeſus; but we confeſs ſome divine Attributes and

Names

Names are given, as only proper to Chriſt, and not to Men or Saints; as, *The Wiſdom and Power of God, The Word of God, A Quickning Spirit, The only begotten Son of God, The Meſſiah, The very Chriſt, The Prince of Life and Peace; The Mighty God, The Everlaſting Father*, &c. theſe are only intended and proper to Chriſt.

32. We do not find *Blaſphemy or Idolatry* excuſed, or any fair pretence uſed for the ſame by *W. P.* in the place quoted (*i. e.* 11 Ch. *Of the Invalidity of* John Faldoe's *Vindication*) as is defamingly alledged againſt him, p. 242. which is about the *Soul of Man*, &c. which *W. P.* there fully Anſwers.

To Sect. 18. which the Author ſtiles, *Some Remarks upon* Geo. Whitehead's *Creed, relating to ſome of the Particulars before-going.*

The nameleſs Author of the *Snake in the Graſs*, having vented his and others Venome and great Spite againſt the People called Quakers in general, and divers Particulars by Name; now, to compleat his Deſign of great Envy, he muſt put forth his Sting in the Tail of his Work, and have a fling and fit of Hiſſing like an angry Snake, or as one that whiſpers out of the Duſt, *Iſa.* 29. 4. againſt the ſaid *G. W.* I being the Perſon aim'd

aim'd at, may now briefly anſwer for Truth and for my ſelf, as concerned.

1. The word *Creed* he impoſes upon me: 'Twas no formal Creed or Summary of our Faith, tho' real Truths by way of Poſitions in the affirmative, as a Chriſtian Teſtimony, in direct Oppoſition to *F. B.*'s great Abuſe, falſe Charge and Perverſions, which with a negative Teſtimony againſt him therein, are both adapted to anſwer his own Terms, Words and Phraſes, that our Teſtimony and Poſitions might be the more apparent againſt his Abuſe and Perverſions; for I know no Adverſary that I find Fault with, but I can freely and in good Conſcience aſſert my own Senſe in the Matters in Controverſie, as well as oppoſe his, though it be not in the manner of a formal *Creed*, yet true in it ſelf; for we ſhould have numerous *Creeds*, if all Poſitions we write in Oppoſition to Oppoſers, muſt be eſteemed *Creeds*, or Summaries and Confeſſions of our Faith; nevertheleſs, we believe what we aſſert and vindicate in each particular.

My Accuſer preſently ſhews his Prejudice and Enmity againſt me without cauſe, *As with a new Confeſſion of Faith, in ſuch dubious and general Terms, as may at firſt ſight deceive the unwary Reader*; though I gave it in as plain and as much in ſcriptural Terms as I could,

could, and as the Matters concerned would admit of. And I know my own Sincerity therein better than my Accuſer, who inſincerely calls me *Honeſt George*, whilſt he is aſperſing me and caſting Dirt at me, as *Deceiving, keeping off contradicting the Heart of the Hereſie, ſtill preſerving it ſafe and untouch'd; and not only ſo, but often with a ſlily, inſinuated Excuſe and Defence of it*, p. 244. So that my confeſſing *Jeſus to be the Chriſt, and both his coming in the Fleſh and in the Spirit*, according to holy Scripture-Teſtimony, and alſo to the *Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, namely, the Holy Doctrin and divine Precepts therein, as given by divine Inſpiration* (on which much of my ſaid Confeſſion againſt *F. Bugg* depends;) this hath no better Acceptance or Reſentment with my Accuſer, than as *no Contradiction to the Heart of Hereſie, but as ſtill preſerving it ſafe and untouch'd*; and which is worſe, *a ſlily inſinuated Excuſe and Defence of it*. Oh ſad Stuff! Whither will not Pride and Envy precipitate ſome Men? What ſcripturally to confeſs *Jeſus Chriſt* and the Holy Scriptures (as above) is this no Contradiction to Hereſie? But to preſerve, excuſe or defend it? What's Hereſie than, pray? Is it to confeſs Jeſus Chriſt come in the Fleſh, *&c.* according to holy Scripture-Teſtimony of him?

him? Oh! for ſhame, leave off ſuch blind Envy and blaſphemous Abuſe.

And now to come to the Point, How or wherein have *I ſlily inſinuated Excuſe and Defence of it* (i. e. *of the Heart of Herſie*, as before?) p. 244. *Thus* (ſaith my Accuſer) *in his firſt Article he confeſſes Jeſus to be the Chriſt, even the ſame Jeſus Chriſt who was born of the Virgin* Mary *at* Bethlehem, *&c.*

I confeſs this is part of my Confeſſion, but cannot believe this is either not contradictory to the Heart of Hereſie, or that it is any Excuſe or Defence of it. Nor that our confeſſing God or Chriſt to be our Light, can be any ſuch Excuſe or Defence. Neither do we attribute the Name *Chriſt* to any (much leſs *to every one*) *of our ſelves*, as we are often falſly accuſed, as here, p. 245. Whence he alſo moſt unjuſtly infers, *That then this will appear that this Confeſſion of* Whitehead's *is a meer Fallacy, while it attributes* no more *to Jeſus Chriſt than to* G. W. p. 245.

Which is a very foul and abſurd Falſhood and notorious Lie in Fact, and contradiction to my ſaid Confeſſion (even ſo far as 'tis cited by himſelf as before) which is, 1. 'We 'ſincerely own, profeſs and confeſs Jeſus to 'be the Chriſt, even the ſame Jeſus Chriſt 'who was born of the Virgin *Mary* at '*Bethlehem* in *Judea*, *Mat.* 2. ſuffered

'Death

' Death upon the Croſs without the Gates ' of *Jeruſalem*, was quickened and raiſed ' again by the Power of God, and aſcended ' into Heaven and Glory, according to the ' Scriptures.

Now have I herein attributed no more to Jeſus Chriſt than to my ſelf, as he ſaith? Where did I ever attribute this to my ſelf? Where's the meer Fallacy? Not in my Confeſſion to Jeſus Chriſt, but in this horrid Abuſe and groſs Perverſion thereof. Did I ever ſay that I am Jeſus Chriſt? Or, that I was born of the Virgin *Mary*? Or, that I ſuffered Death upon the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*? &c. Oh! for ſhame, who cannot ſee ſuch Malice and Madneſs as my Adverſary has vented againſt me in this Matter?

Again, I find no Fallacy in my Confeſſion to Chriſt, as without; nor is there any, unleſs I had denied the Virgin *Mary* (of whom Chriſt was born) to be without, or *Bethlehem*, and *Judea* and *Jeruſalem*, to be without us; nor doth Chriſt, being without, prove him not to be our Light within; for the ſame Chriſt ſaid, *I am the Light of the World*; therefore he is our Light, *yea the Quakers Light* (as he calls it) they being included in the World. Does not the Sun ſhine in our Houſes, becauſe the Body and Fulneſs of it is without them?

My

My Accuſer quibbles and quarrels with *Art.* 10. of my Confeſſion, *viz.* 'Our Mi-'niſters do not teach that the Name of Je-'ſus and Chriſt belong to every Member in 'the Body or Church, as amply as to Chriſt 'the Head. And here he leaves out all the following explanatory part of the Article, (as he calls it) and ſcornfully deſcants upon the Word *amply* being in a different black Character, *leſt* (quoth he) *you ſhould miſtake and think that* George *was Chriſt as amply as Jeſus.* And then goes on ſcoffing, *That was modeſt indeed; but then* George *thou art Chriſt as well as Jeſus, though not ſo amply:* Which is both a falſe Implication, and foreign to my intention. The word *amply* in that place, was only uſed and intended in direct oppoſition to *F. Bugg*'s falſly ſaying, *The Quakers teach, That the Name Jeſus and Chriſt belong to every Member in the Body, as amply as to Chriſt the Head,* New Rome, Ar. p. 47. But even in the ſame 10 *Art.* quoted againſt me, I do not allow any Member to be called *Chriſt*, but expreſly diſſallow it, though I confeſs how Chriſtians have ſome Intereſt in his Name, but not to be called *Jeſus*, but Chriſtians. The explanatory part of my Confeſſion in the ſaid 10th Article, diſingenuouſly left out by this Scoffer, is in theſe Words, *viz.* 'But that the 'divine Anointing (to which Name Chriſt

'hath

'hath relation) virtually is in ſome mea-
'ſure or degree afforded to every Member
'of his Body, but not ſo amply as to him
'the Head; *nor for any Member to be called*
'*Chriſt, but a Chriſtian*; becauſe Chriſt re-
'ceived the Anointing the Holy Spirit
'not by meaſure, but in fulneſs; and be-
'cauſe he is the Head of the Body, the
'Church.

And this very Matter is more fully explain'd in my *Charitable Eſſay*, in Anſwer to *F. Bugg*, p. 4. as before. It was far from my Thoughts or Intention to imply any ſuch thing, as *That I am Chriſt as well as Jeſus*; for I have often written my ſelf *A Servant of Chriſt*; and ſo I am, I humbly bleſs his Name that's above every Name. Therefore I am ſtill very unjuſtly accuſed with *rank Sophiſtry, dodging and deluding, and caſting a Miſt before the Eyes of poor deluded People, or leading them into the Myſtery of Iniquity, or of any Equivocating or Jeſuitical Confeſſion of Faith*, as foully and unjuſtly accuſed, p. 246, 247. I have a Conſcience towards God in what I confeſs, and in good Conſcience teſtifie, That thou my ſcornful, lurking Adverſary, haſt caſt manifold falſe and groſs Defamations upon me, and many others of my Chriſtian Perſuaſion.

And in the true Senſe of Scripture, I have both confeſs'd Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh,

and as he *the Word* was made (or took) Flesh, *Jo.* 1. 14. And more than the *Socinians*, I do still confess, *That as the reasonable Soul and Body is One Man, so He that is God and Man is One Christ.* And whether this will give Satisfaction to an implacable Adversary or no, I value not; knowing my Conscience clear in the Sight of him who judgeth righteously, which I am sure this my unjust Judge and false Accuser is not, who presently after he has stil'd me *Honest George*, unjustly brands me with Infamy, as *Sophistry, Delusion, Depths of Satan, Mystery of Iniquity, Equivocation, Jesuitical Confession*, &c. Oh! rank Malice, bitter Envy, *&c.*

As for my Confession in the 7th *Art.* alledged against me, it stands good and true, *viz.* 'We own no such saying, as that the 'Holy Doctrin or Divine Precepts of Scri-'pture, is either Dust, Death, or the Ser-'pent's Meat, but truly profitable to us by 'the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit given 'to us, *&c.* And this was in direct opposition to *F. Bugg*'s saying, *These Quakers, who pretend to own the Precepts and Doctrin of the Bible to be holy and blessed, yet say 'tis Dust and Death, the Serpent's Meat*, &c. *Apol. Introd.* p. 18. to his *New Rome.* [We do not believe any of these Quakers ever so said of the Precepts and Doctrin, nor do they own any such Saying, I wholly disown it.]

But

But then to beg the Question, *What was it you called Dust and Serpent's Meat? Was it nothing else but the Ink and Paper? Did any Body ever say, That these were not Dust? Or, Is that any part of the Controversie betwixt us?* Snake p. 249. Here he yields the Point; he grants the Ink and Paper to be *Dust*. I said, *Will decay and turn to Dust*; but so will not the *Word*, the *Gospel*, nor the *Holy Doctrin contain'd in Scripture*. And it has been confess'd by *F. B.* and others, That *Holiness* is not ascrib'd *to the Paper and Ink* (or Inky Characters) that will decay, but to the *Holy Doctrin* and *Precepts* which will not decay, but be permanent and endure; and therefore called the *Holy Scriptures*, with respect to the Holy Matters therein contained. That the Books and Writings in Ink and Paper will wear out, so will not the *Word*, is evident. *Jehoiakim* King of *Judah*, could burn *Jeremiah* the Prophet's Roll or Book, writ with Ink by *Baruch*, but not the *Word* of the Lord, nor properly the Words thereof; for the same *Word* caused all the former Words to be written again, after the Roll was burnt, *Jer.* 36. If then the Books, the Paper and Ink be combustible, or will decay and turn to Dust, but not the *Word*, nor the *Doctrin*; where's then the Controversie indeed, when the same thing is granted on both sides?

He quotes *Gr. Myſt.* p. 302. Sect. 11. p. 146, 147. as ſaying, *Paper and Ink is not infallible, that will come to Duſt*; unto which the *Word*, *Chriſt* and the *Spirit* is preferred, in the ſame place quoted. And in the ſaid *Gr. Myſt.* p. 78. by Letter, he there means *Paper* and *Ink*; but the *Scripture*, the thing it ſpeaks of, is *ſpiritual*, the *Word* is *Spirit*. And further, p. 127. the Scripture (or Writing) it ſelf, without the Spirit that gave it forth, is a dead Letter in it ſelf. *The Spirit is that that gave forth the Scriptures.*

For my part, as I am not in the leaſt conſcious to my ſelf of the leaſt Contempt of Holy Scripture, nor yet of the Bible; for I have always preferr'd it to all other Books extant in the World, and more affected Reading therein than any other Book, even from my Childhood; and often bleſs divine Providence for preſerving to us the Scriptures: So I know of none among us guilty of contemning them: Neither is what's ſaid, from any Contempt of Scripture, no more than it is of the Earth and the Heavens, to ſay, They ſhall wax old and periſh, but the *Word* that made them endureth, *Pſal.* 102. 25, 26. *Heb.* 1. 11, 12. But ſay what we can in this Caſe to clear our ſelves of any Contempt to the Holy Scripture, this our uncharitable Judge and Accuſer will not believe us: He's bent to aſperſe, he has

has ſwallow'd down ſo much of the ſoure Leaven of the Malice of a few falſe Brethren, Perſecutors and Apoſtates, from whom he derives much of his Authority; and thus ſcurrilouſly and moſt falſly impoſes upon me, *viz. And therefore* George, *notwithſtanding all thy mealy Modeſty, it is; it is indeed* George, *it is the very Doctrin of the Scriptures which you blaſpheme as Duſt, and Death, and Serpent's Meat, on purpoſe to bring Men off from trying your pernicious Hereſies by thoſe ſacred Oracles*, p. 250. This is a pernicious Abuſe and Calumny, againſt my ſelf and others of us (to out-face us againſt our very Senſe and Conſciences) and in good Conſcience I teſtifie againſt it; it never entred into my Intention or Thoughts ſo to blaſpheme the Doctrin of the Scriptures, as to term or deem it Duſt, Death or Serpent's Meat: The Lord rebuke this lying, envious Spirit.

Neither do *I viliſie the written Doctrin and Precepts of God, in compariſon of our New Light* (as he falſly calls it) p. 250, 251. but reverently eſteem them: The Man makes no Conſcience of defaming us. Neither do we *quarrel with the Law and the Teſtimony*, nor yet with Writing or Scripture, as 'tis in *Ink or Paper*, but diſtinguiſh between the *Writing* and the *Things written*, which is no Contempt to either. We are

thankful to Divine Providence for both the Scripture, or Writing, and the Holy Doctrin and Divine Precepts therein written; for they teſtifie unto Chriſt our Light, and our Right to the Truth of them.

And to what he ſaith, *If any do not teach the ſame*, i. e. *according to the Law and the Teſtimony, or written Word, it is becauſe there is no Light in them*, Iſa. 8. 20. And then puts this Emphaſis upon it, *No Light, George! Mark that: Your falſe Pretences to the Light within are here over-rul'd*, p. 251.

I deny that our Pretences to the Light within is either falſe or here over-rul'd; if they ſpeak not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is *no Morning* to them. If he'll ſee the Note from the Hebrew in ſome Bibles, he may ſee *no Morning* in the Margin over againſt *no Light*: Then let him Mark that. But is there no Light in the Creation before Morning, either inward or outward, pray? Did not the Light ſhine in Darkneſs, before it ſhined out of Darkneſs? And had not the Believers a more ſure Word of Prophecy, whereunto they did well to take heed, as unto a Light ſhining in a dark Place, until the Day dawned and the Day-ſtar aroſe in their Hearts? 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. And are not many reproved by the Light them in, for telling Lies and ſpeaking contrary to the Word? *&c.* And therefore there

was

was ſome true Light in them, before the Morning appeared to them.

And tho' my Accuſer ſays; *Theſe, and ſuch-like Texts, detect and explode the miſerable Ignorance and Blaſphemy of theſe Pretenders to Light.* For which we have his own *ipſe dixit*, and much ſuch Raillery, but know no plain Texts of Scripture yet produced by him, that ſo detects us; but his own Falſhood and great Ignorance about the Light, is very apparent.

Again, he falſly defames and reprobaches me, from p. 28. *Of Innocency Triumphant*, with *excuſing and juſtifying Diabolical Suggeſtions in the Quaker-Refuge* (he ſaith) *againſt the Authority of the ſacred Scripture*, by ſaying, *That it queſtioned but ſome, not all*, p. 252.

This Accuſer has a moſt odious, injurious courſe of defaming and perverting, as well as curtalizing our Words, wherein he has taken part with his famous Author *F. Bugg*, to whom the Anſwer was given, on which he grounds his black Charge againſt me, *Of juſtifying Diabolical Suggeſtions*, &c. In which Anſwer I expreſly declare thus, *viz. His Accuſation that the Quakers inſinuate, in a Book called* The Quakers Refuge, *That all that the true Prophets ſpake was falſe, and all that the falſe Prophets ſpoke was true*, p. 47. *New Rome Unm.* p. 23. We diſown theſe Ex-

preſſions, and I think they are not duly inferred from the ſaid Book, queſtioning whether *Some Words were not ſpoken by wicked Men, ſome by wiſe Men, ill applied; ſome by good Men, ill expreſſed*, &c. Now, at my ſaying, *Yet this queſtioned but of ſome Words in Scripture, not all*; he takes occaſion to Rail fearfully againſt me, as a *Juſtifier of Diabolical Suggeſtions*. When my Anſwer was not with the leaſt intent to oppoſe or leſſen the Authority of the Sacred Scriptures; but in direct oppoſition to *F. Bugg*'s Calumny, in theſe general, odious and falſe Expreſſions, *viz. That the Quakers inſinuate, that* What *the true Prophets ſpake, was falſe.* Which Expreſſion we utterly deny, as both in themſelves groſly falſe, againſt the true Prophets, and falſly charged on the Quakers, to defame them.

And as to the Queſtions cited out of the *Quak. Refuge*, at which Offence is taken, 1. They are not mine. 2. I do not believe they are the Author's of that *Quak. Refuge*, tho' cited by him. 3. It is apparent he does not eſpouſe them as his own Judgment, nor make them the Matter in that preſent Controverſie, nor reſolve them in the Affirmative; but ſeems to recite and wave them, as Originally proceeding from ſome other Perſon, as I underſtand. The furtheſt that can be drawn from my ſaid Anſwer

ſwer to *F. B.* that may ſeem offenſive (which I ſhould be ſorry for, if 'twere really ſo) is my ſeeming to grant the Queſtion, *That in ſome Words ſome true Prophets were miſtaken.* And if this be made an Offence, I think 'tis no real one, for I deſigned none: However, I ſtill confeſs, *I believe the Record of Scripture to be true.* Good Men, and ſome true Prophets alſo, have been and may be miſtaken in ſome things, and have had their Weakneſſes and Failings truly recorded in Scripture; and alſo their Deliverances, for good Ends and Admonition to others. Was not *Samuel* a good Man and a Prophet, and yet miſtaken, when he took *Eliab* for the Lord's Anointed? 1 *Sam.* 16, 6. 7. And in the Argument upon *Job* in the ancient Bible, is marked, 'That Job *maintaineth a good* 'Cauſe, *but handleth it evil. Again, his Ad-* 'verſaries *have an evil Matter, but they de-* 'fend *it craftily. Moreover, he was aſſured* 'that God *had not rejected him; yet through his* 'great *Torments and Afflictions, he burſt forth* 'into *many Inconveniences both of Words and* 'Sentences. See the Argument at large.

And was not the Prophet *Elijah* miſtaken when he thought himſelf alone, or none in *Iſrael* but himſelf, that was zealous for the Lord God of Hoſts? But what ſaith the Anſwer of God unto him? *I have reſerved unto my*

my ſelf ſeven thouſand Men, that have not bowed the knee to Baal, 1 King. 19. 10, 18. Rom. 11. 3, 4. And to ſay but little of the Old Prophet that perſuaded the Young Prophet, contrary to the Word of the Lord, 1 *King.* 13. I could inſtance *Jonas*, *David*, and ſeveral others that were good Men, who had ſome Weakneſſes and Miſtakes in Words and Actions, yet the Lord was good to them and helped them, according to the Integrity of their Hearts towards him. And theſe Things being truly recorded in Scripture for Inſtruction and Admonition, we truly eſteem the Scripture-Record thereof. And even where the *Words*, *Lies*, *Blaſphemies* and Actions of the Devil, wicked Men and Perſecutors, and the Judgments which befel them, are recorded in the Scriptures, we own the Record or Hiſtory thereof to be true, and highly eſteem it for Inſtruction and Warning to Men. And to diſtinguiſh between the Words of God in Scripture, and the Words of the Devil, is but what the Scripture it ſelf doth, which can be no Contempt to it; for I have known ſome ſtumbled, by ſome of the Prieſts making no diſtinction, but calling all that's written in Scripture *the Word of God*; as one that was the Mayor of *Thetford* near 40 Years ago, told me, That a Prieſt wanting Induction

duction into the vacant Benefice, and preaching there for Approbation, took his Text out of the Words wherewith the Devil tempted Chriſt, *Mat.* 4. And bidding the People hearken to the Word of God, as they ſhould find it written in ſuch a Chapter and Verſe; whereupon this Perſon that told me of it was ſo offended, that he would not give his Voice to chuſe the ſaid Prieſt, becauſe he had told them, That was the Word of God, which was the Words of the Devil. Now let none be ſo diſingenuous as to take this as in Contempt of Holy Scripture, Doctrin or Precepts therein; for where either the Words, Blaſphemies, wicked Actions or Perſecutions of the Devil or Men, are therein mentioned, the Record thereof is true, and in Teſtimony againſt them, and the intent of ſuch Record holy, juſt and good.

Farther my Accuſer tells me, *Nor is my Salvo more ingenuous* in the *Eleventh Article.* And why ſo? *It is really, ſay I, contrary to our Faith and Principle, to make Chriſt Jeſus himſelf Only a Figure, a Veil or Garment,* p. 254. Which was in direct oppoſition to his Author *F. Bugg*'s falſly ſaying, *The Quakers would make Chriſt Only a Figure, a Veil, a Garment*, implied by way of Queſtion, p. 58. *New Rome Ar.* Here he quarrels with

with the word *Only* as with the word *Amply*, and accuſeth me with *Equivocating, and that this is but a Negative Confeſſion: But really* George (quoth he) *this is not re-aſſuming your Chriſtian Teſtimony in the Affirmative, as thou didſt promiſe*, &c. *ſtill hiding your ſelf in the Dark in Negatives: But we would know affirmatively, what it is you do profeſs; and this thou didſt promiſe, and this thou haſt not perform'd*, p. 255, 256.

Here he accuſeth me with breach of Promiſe; but very falſly, as in the ſaid 11th Article is plain, that my Confeſſion of Chriſt Jeſus himſelf, is not only Negative but Affirmative, namely, *He being the Subſtance and End of all Figures, Types and Shadows.* Is not this Affirmative, pray? And as remote from Truth is his accuſing the *Quakers Books of calling Chriſt Jeſus a Type or Figure of their Light within*, p. 263, 264. I know no ſuch Books of the Quakers that ſo call Chriſt Jeſus *A Type of our Light within*, but that he is our Light, which hath inlighten'd us among the reſt of Mankind.

It's implied by way of Queſtion, *That Chriſt cloathed himſelf in Fleſh and Blood, and that he took Fleſh*, &c. *for ſo* (quoth he) *it may be ſaid that our Soul is cloathed with our Body, as with a Garment or Veil. It is not Words, but the meaning that we contend about*, ſaith he, p. 257.

We

We know beſt our own Meaning, being well ſatisfied that 'tis according to Holy Scripture. Where's then the difference? He then quarrels with our Meaning, not with the Words here, but elſewhere; he doth as his Author *F. Bugg* has done with the words *Veil* and *Garment*, in *J. P.*'s Queſtion to *Profeſſors*: But this Author yields the Point, he aſſents to both; *As our Soul is clothed with our Body, as with a Garment or Veil*; and ſo of Chriſt. Which warrants *J. P.*'s Queſtion againſt his Author *F. B.* and himſelf, at leaſt ſo far as not to make it a Subject of any further Contention againſt us.

Again, my Accuſer brings a heavy, black Charge upon me in theſe Words, *viz. In this ſame 11th Article we are now upon, after your full and Affirmative Declaration* (before he would have it Negative) *you ſubborn Two Texts as Favourers of your damnable Hereſie before-told, yet (ſay you, ſlily) his Fleſh was called the Veil*, Heb. 10. *And he took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made like unto Men, and was found in the σχηματι, Shape or Figure of a Man*, Phil. 2. 6, 7. And then exclaims, *Ah* George! George! *I could forgive thee any thing but this: What! put upon us at this rate!*

It

It ſeems my citing thoſe Two Texts, and alledging them to prove that the word *Veil* was applied to Chriſt's Fleſh which he took upon him, and the Word σχῆμα, *Shape* or *Figure* of a Man, to the form of his Manhood or outward Man, tho' I intended *no* other than that, without the leaſt Contempt to Chriſt: Such Words might be uſed as they had been by ſome of our Friends. For this it ſeems I have committed ſuch a heinous and unpardonable Crime or Sin, as this my ſevere Judge cannot forgive. This is repreſented as my higheſt Offence; and truly I ſhall not need to ſeek to him for Abſolution or Pardon, nor to be my Confeſſor: I have a merciful and faithful High Prieſt to apply and appeal to; I need not go to unmerciful and implacable Ones for Pardon; eſpecially ſuch a one as has ſo ſhamefully calumniz'd me with *ſubborning Two Texts as Favourers of damnable Hereſie*. How comes this Accuſer, in his Fallibility or Uncertainty, thus ſeverely to condemn me, when he cannot refute Matter of Fact about the Two ſaid Texts, being alledged in behalf of my Friend's meaning, and not at all with the leaſt Intention to leſſen the Dignity or Glory of the Son of God? No, far be it from me. And where's my unpardonable Sin in the Application of the Text, *Phil.* 2? Why

he

he ſaith, *George Whitehead brings in the word Figure, which is not in the Engliſh Tranſlation.* And what then? *But let him have it, he himſelf makes it ſynonimous to Shape*, p. 263. And he is forced to let me have it, becauſe he cannot well deny it, without Diſparagement to himſelf. But herein he would place on me a Miſ-application of the Words, [*Who being found in the Shape or Figure of a Man*, &c.] *And* therefore ſaith, *what relation has this to the calling Chriſt Jeſus a Type or Figure of their Light within, which I have ſhewn above out of the Quakers Books?* And I have denied this as a Falſhood before, and now declare againſt his manifeſt Perverſion and Injury to me, and my Words herein. For as I ſincerely diſown the Words charged, *viz. The calling Chriſt Jeſus a Type or Figure of our Light within*, I could not apply the Words before in the Text, *Phil.* 2. to have any relation thereto; much leſs as proof of that which I never held: And I know none of us that doth ſo call Jeſus Chriſt *A Type of our Light within*, he being the Fountain thereof. Nor that Chriſt is *Only a Figure*, as falſly charged by *F. Bugg*. Which Perverſion, ſo far as I can find, was firſt forged from theſe Words, in the Book *Saul's Errand*, viz. *Chriſt in the Fleſh without them, is their Example or Figure; which is both one.* For his being their Example,

1 *Pet.*

1 *Pet.* 2. 21. & 4. 1. & 1, 15. & *John* 13. 15. are quoted. See alſo *Luke* 2. 31. he was called *a Sign.* Now hence to ſay he was *Only a Sign*, were a groſs Perverſion; Chriſt was our *Example.* Now hence to ſay he was nothing elſe but an *Example*, were an Abuſe and to leſſen his Dignity, and a variation from the Senſe; as our Adverſary has done upon Truſt of his Author *F. Bugg*; upon his falſe Report, which is beſides all Juſtice, Morality and judicial Proceedings. Now the Queſtion is, Whether *Figure* may be made ſynonimous to *Example*, for the words *Example* or *Figure*, as before? I conceive it may. For *Type* or *Figure* ſometimes points at a thing to come, as in *Rom.* 5. 14. who was the τύπος, Figure of him that was to come. And ſometimes *Type* or *Figure* denotes a preſent Example or Pattern, as in *Phil.* 3. 17. *Mark them which walk ſo, as ye have us for* τύπον, *Example.* And the ſame Word is uſed in 2 *Theſ.* 3. 9. & 1 *Tim.* 4. 12. & *Titus* 2. 7. & 1 *Cor.* 10. 11. only in different Caſes, or Terminations. And the word ὑπόδειγματα, *an Example or Type*, John 13. 15. Heb. 9. 23. Thus *Example* or *Type* are made ſynonimous in *T. C.*'s Lexicon, and the like in *Crit. Sacr.* but more fully explain'd; for there Ὑπόδειγμα, i. e. *Exemplum, Exemplar, Triplicem habet in Scriptura ſignificatum.* 1. *Significat Typum ſeu Figuram rerum,*

rorum, vel præteritarum, Heb. 8. 5. *vel futurarum*, Heb. 9. 23. 2. *Exemplum imitationis*, John 13. 15. 1 Tim. 4. 12. Titus 4. 7. 3. *Exemplum Monitionis, sive Cautelæ*, ut 2 Pet. 2. 6.

i. e. *Exemplum, Exemplar*, hath a threefold Signification in Scripture. 1. It signifies *a Type* or *Figure* of Things, either past or to come. 2. An Example of Imitation. 3. An Example of Warning or Caution.

Now see how synonimously the Terms *Type, Figure, Pattern* and *Example*, are rendered in Scripture, and of what extent, not only in relation to the Types under the Law, but in some respect to Christ and his Ministers, tho' he be also confessed to be the Antitype, Substance and End of all Legal Shadows, Types and Figures. But I have not *called Christ himself a Type of our Light within*, nor justified the same.

As to my Accuser's Offence at my saying *Christ's Flesh is called the Veil*, Heb. 10. 20. it was to remove an Offence taken against my Friend *J. P.* for using the same. And it would have become this Adversary to have forborn his blasphemous Scoffing at my Light; as, *George, if thy Light has hitherto forgot to tell thee*; &c. I bless the Lord my God, who is my Light, Life and Salvation; he has shewn me the new and living way of the New Covenant, which our blessed Lord

and Saviour Jesus Christ consecrated, prepared or set open through the Veil, that is to say, his Flesh; nyea, through his Sufferings and Death, as being the Testator, he hath enforced that New Testament or second Covenant; he took away the first, that he might establish the second; and so hath open'd the Passage into eternal Life, into the Holiest of Holies within the Veil, and beyond all the Shadows and Veils under the Law.

It was in the most holy Place within the second Veil in the Tabernacle, which was called the *Holiest of all* in the Old Covenant, that *the golden Censor and Ark of the Testament were put, and the golden Pot which had Manna, and* Aaron's *Rod that had budded, and the Tables of the Testament, and over the Ark the Cherubims of Glory shadowing the Mercy-seat*, Heb. 9. *Exod.* 26. So the most excellent things were within the Veil, tho' there was a Beauty and Glory also without it.

All which, I doubt not were Shadows of the New Covenant, and the spiritual Dispensation thereof in Christ Jesus, in whom the *most holy place* of that divine Service and Worship (in the New Covenant Sanctuary which the Lord has placed in the midst of his People) is *in the Spirit and in the Truth*. And all our spiritual Blessings and heavenly

Trea-

Treaſures are in Chriſt Jeſus, who is our Sanctuary and Hiding-place.

And it is in the inmoſt, or moſt inward and ſpiritual Diſpenſation of *the New Covenant*, that Mercy and Forgiveneſs is receiv'd, and Chriſt moſt livingly and effectually known to us and enjoyed; and in him the moſt holy and heavenly Places, wherein the true ſpiritual Believers ſit down with him; and as being waſhed from their Sins in his Blood by his Spirit, are his Church and Sanctuary alſo, and thereby have boldneſs to enter into the holy Place, even by *that new and living Way* (which Chriſt hath prepared for us through the Veil, that is to ſay, his Fleſh, *Heb.* 10.) that we may follow him therein into *Heaven* it ſelf. And what entrance through Chriſt our Mediator we have here in meaſure received into this new and living Way, and holy and heavenly Places in him, we doubt not but it is to us an Earneſt of a more full Enjoyment of Heaven and Glory hereafter, with Chriſt Jeſus our Fore-runner, Leader and Captain of our Salvation, we continuing faithful to the end in this his new and living Way, as true and conſtant Followers of him.

God in his great Love and Wiſdom has afforded ſeveral Diſpenſations, one higher and more glorious than another, in order to bring Man nearer and nearer

to himſelf; as that of the Law; and of Shadows and Types; that of the Prophets; that of *John* the *Baptiſt*; that of Chriſt in the Fleſh, and that of Chriſt in the Spirit and New Covenant, which is higher, more powerful and more glorious than the former, and therein a more clear knowledge of Chriſt than in all the former, wherein there was ſome Sight of him through Shadows and Veils, but by his divine Light ſhining in our Hearts God is pleaſed to give us the Light of the knowledge of his Glory in the Face of his dear Son Chriſt Jeſus, that we all with open Face, as in a Glaſs, may behold the Glory of God, and be changed into the ſame Image from Glory to Glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. & Ch. 4. 6, 7.

Now, tho' our Adverſary has made a deal of Diſpute and Quarrel with us about calling *Chriſt's Fleſh the Veil*, as in *Heb.* 10. yet he is fain to grant, *That Chriſt's Body is called a Veil in relation to its Type, the Veil of the Temple*, p. 262, 263. but he'll have this *not to be in the Quakers Senſe. They call it a Veil*; *that is* (ſaith he) *a Garment, in contradiſtinction to its being Chriſt's Subſtance, and of his Nature*, p. 262. Whereas its rather in contradiſtinction to its Being, his Divine Natnre, or to its being in the firſt place, or *principally* or *chiefly* Chriſt himſelf (who is the

the Son of God) for whom the Body was prepared, becauſe he did pre-exiſt it, or was in Being before he took upon him that Body, even in his Father's Glory before the World began, wherewith he is glorified. However, *the Veil*, which was *Chriſt's Fleſh*, (through which he ſet open the new and living Way) we never deny to be Chriſt's Body, or to be a real Body, but own it was; and never believed it to be a Fantaſtical Body, as I have often ſaid; but that Chriſt the Son of God took upon him real Fleſh and Blood of our Nature, yet pure and incorrupt in him. And as his Fleſh was called *the Veil*, it anſwers its Type or Figure, *i. e.* the Veil of the moſt Holy Place, or Oracle where God gave Anſwers, 1 *Kings* 6. 20. & 8. 6, 8. & 2 *Chron.* 3. 10, 16. And theſe *moſt Holy Places* in the Tabernacle and Temple, being Places of divine Service, then peculiar to the High Prieſt to enter into, their Antitype is in Chriſt Jeſus, the New Covenant, where in the Spirit and in the Truth, God is truly worſhipped, and meets with (and ſpeaks to) his People, even by Chriſt Jeſus their High Prieſt, who is preſent in the midſt of his Church and Aſſemblies of his People, the true and ſpiritual Worſhippers, who meet in his Name, Spirit and Power, whoſe Light and Truth

brings its Followers unto his Holy Tabernacles, *Pſal.* 43. 3.

And as to Chriſt's Subſtance and Nature, what does our Oppoſer mean thereby? How has he diſtinguiſhed in this Point? Chriſt has in him a *divine Nature*, as well as that of *Man*, which he hath alſo in the pureſt Senſe. But which is the greateſt? Is not the divine Nature, the *Deity* in him, greater than the Manhood? As he ſaid, *My Father is greater than all, greater than I*, John 10. 29. Nevertheleſs, as our great and *only Mediator and Interceſſor*, it was neceſſary he ſhould be Man, as he is the moſt glorious, heavenly Man; and as the Chriſt of God he is ſpiritually *in* us, *in* his Saints and Members, in ſome meaſure, by his Spirit, Light, Life and Power, even as the *incorruptible, immortal Seed* in Man is of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt; and therein all true ſpiritual Believers do in meaſure partake of the divine Nature, being born again of this incorruptible Seed.

The groſs Calumnies, cruel Mockeries, falſe Stories and Perverſions of the Author of *The Snake in the Graſs*, are therein ſo numerous; together with his partial picking, nibling, mincing and carping at our Books, which is ſo perverſe, and much on't ſo ſilly, that I confeſs many of them are waved in this

this Anſwer, as not worthy of ſpending more precious time about them; and I ſhall leave the ſaid Author to the juſt Judgment of him that judgeth righteouſly, wiſhing his Repentance before it be too late.

And tho' he ſculks and hides himſelf, as if he were afraid or aſhamed to own his Work with his Name to it; ſo am not I of my Name or Vindication; tho' I be (and expect to be) reproached and miſrepreſented for Chriſt's ſake, whoſe Servant I am,

George Whitehead.

A BRIEF

EXAMINATION

OF

Some Paſſages,

IN THE

Second Book of the Author

OF

The Snake in the Graſs:

FALSLY STILED,

Satan diſ-rob'd from his Diſguiſe of Light: Or, The Quakers laſt Shift to cover their monſtrous Hereſies, laid fully open.

WHEN I looked upon the Title of the ſaid Book, ſtiled, *Satan diſ-rob'd from his Diſguiſe of Light*: With this additional reproachful Title; *Or, The Quakers laſt Shift to cover their monſtrous Hereſies*; and being

By

By the Author of the Snake in the Graſs, I did ſuppoſe it to be the Second Part to the ſame Tune, or much of the ſame Nature with the former, full of Bitterneſs and Scorn, by the reviling Title, and no fair Reply to *T. Ellwood*'s Anſwer; and ſo it appears; and I expect will be made farther appear, if *T. Ellwood* deems it worth the while to undertake it. But that which appear'd moſt ſtrange to me and ſome others, was, in the Title of the ſaid Book, it is thus declared; *Which alſo may ſerve for a Reply (as to the main Points of Doctrin) to* Geo. Whitehead's *Anſwer to the Snake in the Graſs; to be publiſhed the end of the next Month, if this prevent it not.*

Which appeared very ſtrange to me, and the Man's preſumptive Falſhood the greater, I having a great part of the Copy of my Anſwer to *The Snake in the Graſs* in my Hands, when I firſt ſaw theſe Words in Print; and the reſt of my Copy then in the Printers Hands, which we did not hear they lent him to make Reply to; and when I lookt over his Book, I neither found any repetition of my Anſwer, nor Reply thereto. However he's ſo confident and boaſting in his own Work, that he takes it for granted, That not only the Quakers are put to their laſt Shift, but alſo that his pretended Reply to *T. Ellwood*'s Anſwer to *G. Keith*'s Narrative, may alſo ſerve for a Reply to *G. Whitehead*'s

Anſwer

Anſwer to *The Snake in the Graſs*: Which would ſeem a cunning Piece of Divination indeed, to Reply to a Book before he ſees it or knows it. But if he will ſtill have his ſaid Reply a ſufficient Reply thereunto, he may go on in's own Conceit, and ſave himſelf a further Labour of Replying, leſt he give himſelf the Lie, by giving the World to underſtand that what he has ſaid may ſerve for a Reply to *Geo. Whitehead*'s Anſwer, may not ſerve for a Reply.

However, he ſeems to have taken upon himſelf a heavy Task, in being an Advocate for *George Keith*; and more heavy, to reconcile the Contradictions charged upon him by *Tho. Ellwood*, *John Pennington* and his Brother *Edward*, and partly for *Baptiſts* and *Presbyterians*, and all againſt the Quakers in his Reply; but very partial in carping at our Words and Anſwers in many places, without taking notice of the unwarrantable Expreſſions, Abſurdities and Contradictions of our Adverſaries, and yet in general Terms excuſes them; but in no ſmall Contradiction to himſelf, and the ſad Account and ill Characters he has given in his *Snake in the Graſs*, 2d Part, Sect. 3. pag. 17, 18. both of *Presbyter*, *Anabaptiſt*, *Independent*, *Quaker*, &c. as all under *Enthuſiaſm*, *of* Rome's *dreſſing in ſeveral Shapes and Forms*, *and as a plentiful Harveſt of* Rome's *reaping*, &c.

But

But now he can advocate and take part with any of them againſt the Quakers, like ſome mercinary Soldier of Fortune.

I do not intend to ſpend much time here to Anſwer his ſaid Reply, though 'tis no great Difficulty to do; but to take notice of a few Paſſages in it, wherein I and ſome others are concerned, and injuriouſly dealt with therein.

1. My excepting againſt that made Expreſſion *Co-creator*, as uſed by the Baptiſt, telling of God being *Co-creator* with the Father; I confeſs I am no more reconciled to the Expreſſion now, than I was when firſt I queſtioned it as unſcriptural; whereby I never intended not to allow the *Word* to be God, or to be the Son of God, as I am moſt injuriouſly accuſed, p. 2. For divers of my ancient and firſt Writings in Print ſhew the contrary, that I own *the Word* to be *God*, and Creator too. But the Phraſe *God Co-creator with God*, I think ſtill implies Two Creators, and conſequently Two Gods. 'Tis not the Partitle *co with*, in this Caſe, will excuſe the Matter, for *co* or *con* is *ſimul together*, as Co-workers, *Co-partners*, which are more diſtinct Agents than one: But the *Creator* is but *one God*, *one Word*, *one Spirit*, and ſo *one Creator*. But this invented word *Co-creator* was brought by the Baptiſts for proof *That the Light in Man, wherewith the*

word

word God as Co-creator lighteth every Man, is the Light of Reason, the Light of Nature, &c. consequently but *a created Light*; which I deny. Seeing that it is the same Life that was in the Word, that was the Light of Men, *John* 1. 4. What good Doctrin or good Sense were it then to say, That the word God was Co-creator with the Father of his own Life, Light and Power? And no better Sense can I make of the Baptist's Notion of the Light in this Case, nor of this Man's excusing him. Besides, a learn'd and more modetate and ingenious Person, has lately made the like Exception against the word *Co-creator* in a printed Paper, called, *Reflections upon some Passages in G. Keith's Narrative*; where he saith,

'It seems to me that the word *Co-creator* 'might justly be rejected by *G. Whitehead*, 'being a word neither us'd in the Holy 'Scriptures, nor by any of the ancient 'Councils; and it seems to import a Con-'ceit that there are Two Efficients of the 'Creation, one having a creative Power di-'stinct from the other. Yet, withal, he is pleased to give this gentle Reflection on me by the way. 'Tho' *G. W.* has not spoken 'with that Caution and Accuracy which he 'should have us'd in a Matter of so grand 'Importance; which I do the more easily bear from him because of his Moderation.

Sup-

Suppoſe that in ſome Paſſages, in ſome of my former Writings, as to the Circumſtance of Words or Expreſſions, there may be ſome Deficiency, or want ſome Explication or Diſtinction, or ſomething dubious, and the Particulars thereof were ſhewn me, I hope I ſhould not be wanting to give my Explication to the Satisfaction of the Moderate and Ingenuous. As to the Matters intended by me, I know the Lord gave me a true Senſe and Sight, by his Power, in my young and early Years, he having inclined my Heart after him from my Youth, I bleſs his Holy Name.

The ſame Perſon whom I cited before, goes on, *viz.* 'I do not conceive that he, '(*i. e.* G. W.) denies either the Divinity 'or Humanity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: 'The Father is Creator, the Son Creator, 'the Holy Ghoſt Creator; and yet they are 'not Three Creators, but One Creator. Thus he: Conſequently, not properly called *Co creators*; for that would imply Three Creators.

And I think I might more warrantably oppoſe the ſame than my Adverſary imply Three *intelligent Beings* in the Godhead, by his definition of *a Perſon*, that every *intelligent BEING is a Perſon*; that is the meaning of the word *Perſon* (ſaith he) p. 5.

Whence

Whence it follows, That if there be Three distinct Persons in the Deity, they are Three distinct *intelligent Beings*; unless he'll argue as one of his Brethren did; *They are not Three Substances, therefore Three Persons.* Another having given *Aquinas* his definition of a *Person*, as being an *individual Substance of a rational Nature, which is neither the part of another, nor upheld by another.* But now if they be not *Three Beings*, nor *Three Substances*; how well have these Men defended a principal Article of their Faith? Seeing the Father, the Word and Holy Ghost are owned by Christians to be *One Being, One Substance*; therefore not *Three Beings* nor *Three Substances.*

My speaking of Christ as the only begotten of the Father, and for his Divinity, as he was the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and express Image of his divine Substance, and thereupon questioning *T. Danson*, where doth the Scripture say, *That his Soul was created?* This Question is no Determination that it was, or was not. Christ, as God, his Soul was uncreated. As Man, his Soul or Spirit was not the Deity, but formed and assumed by the Word. The Word, or Son of God, who made the Worlds, was not a Creature, because he made all Creatures. Though he took upon him a most pure and perfect Soul

and

and Body, he took upon him the Seed of *Abraham*, that he might in both Soul and Body ſuffer for Mankind, and ſympathize with us in bearing our Sorrows and carrying our Griefs; and that his Soul might be in Travel for us, and made an Offering for Sin, and poured out unto Death, *Iſa.* 53. By my ſaid Queſtion I chiefly eyed his Divinity, conſidering him as he proceeded and came out from God, and as he was glorified with the Father, before the World began.

Upon the whole, my Adverſary's Charge of *Hereſie* upon me and the Quakers, *againſt the Incarnation of Chriſt*, p. 2. as alſo his Author *G. Keith*'s publick Aſperſions, *That G. W. diſowns Chriſt to be God, and denied him to be Man*, Narr. p. 16. Theſe are to tell the World, That we own no *Chriſt* at all: Wherein, as they have both groſly wrong'd my Intention, Principle and publick Teſtimony, I am perſuaded *G. K.* has wronged his own Conſcience, and that he muſt needs know the contrary of me, in this and ſome other things, for which he is accountable to the juſt God.

For by queſtioning the Words *created or human Soul*, I did not thereby intend *to deny Chriſt to be truly Man*, as is unduly inſinuated againſt me, p. 2. but rather to own, That tho' Chriſt was truly Man in Soul and Body,

Body, yet that his Soul was more divine than any other Mans or Mens; and therefore he may be ſaid to be a *moſt divine Man*, and more of the divine and increated Life in his Soul, than in any other Man's whatſoever; and that therefore the word *human*, as it relates to the Ground or Earth, from which the Body of Man was taken, I might ſuppoſe was too low or mean a Character or Epithite to give to the *Soul* of Chriſt, or to his ſpiritual glorious Body either; and I hope I deſerve not blame in this, while I was careful not to leſſen the Glory or Dignity of the Son of God, (as he is the Lord from Heaven) by not allowing him to be from beneath or *Earthly*, either in Soul or Body in his glorified State; and I am perſwaded that ſome ſo much inſiſting upon the word *Human Soul and Body of Chriſt*, gives the *Socinians* more advantage than my pleading for his Divinity and Heavenly glory both as God and Man.

To my Queſtion to *Robert Gordon*, I think there's no real Cauſe for Offence to be taken at it, if the Occaſions miniſtred by him, were Impartially taken notice of, which they are not by this partial Adverſary. As *R. G.*'s great Ignorance both of the Light and Saving-work of Chriſt *in* Man; excluding Chriſt's work of Salvation and Juſtification, *&c. as all done and finiſhed without Man*, even

when *no good* is wrought in Man; and pleading for *Imperfection and Sin in Man*, in so much that *Geo. Keith* charged the said *Gordon* with 18 corrupt Doctrins, and above 20 Lyes and false Accusations, in the conclusion of my Book, Entituled, *The Nature of Christianity in the true Light asserted*, Printed *Anno* 1671. And yet this officious Adversary takes his part, excusing him, in defence of *G. Keith* against us, as he has done also in his *Snake in the Grass*, which is such a piece of confused Mixture and Medley, as I have seldom ever met withal.

My Question to *R. Gordon* as Cited: 'Dost thou look for Christ as the Son of 'Mary, to appear outwardly in a bodily 'Existence *to save thee?* If thou dost, thou 'mayest look until thy Eyes drop out, be-'fore thou wilt see *such an* appearance of 'him?

And what proof is made of this against me? But that I do *not acknowledge that Christ has now the Body of a Man, or will come in that Body to Judge the World.*

Answ. Neither do I deny it. If I do not acknowledge it in this Passage, I do in many others, namely, that Christ as the Heavenly Man has his own proper glorious Body, wherein he will come to Judge the World at the last day. And therefore do not hold that Christ has *no bodily Existence*

(or being) *without us*, as *G. K.* accuſeth me, *Narr.* p. 16. He wrongs me in this, as in divers other things.

But upon *R. Gordon*'s pretending *a perfect Juſtification and Redemption of Sinners without them*, when *no good is wrought in them*; and yet granting that Chriſt's appearing the *ſecond time is without Sin to Salvation.*

But then his deferring this till the Reſurrection of the Body, this I confeſs, was ſo offenſive to me, that I put the ſaid Queſtion; the reaſon whereof appears more at large in my ſaid Anſwer, *Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 29. It being always my Judgment, with many others, that Salvation from Sin ſhould be expected in this Life, and Chriſt's ſecond appearance for that end alſo, mentioned *Heb.* 9. 28. That this ought not to be put off till the laſt day, but expected even in this Life as in the Apoſtles days. There were thoſe then that looked for him to whom his appearance the ſecond time without Sin unto Salvation was promiſed, and the true Believers were not diſappointed of their expectations in that weighty matter. As many have been who have expected to ſee Chriſt's *outward coming in Perſon* (with their *carnal Eyes*) to ſave them. Beſides, 'tis true in Fact, that thoſe carnal Eyes of many fail them, drop out or rot, before they can ſee Chriſt's outward appearance, or coming in

the last day to Judgment. And *G. Keith* himself, as well as I, have charged false and corrupt Doctrin upon *Robert Gordon*, particularly in his asserting, *That Redemption, Justification and Reconciliation, is finished and compleated by what Christ did and suffered outwardly, and not in our Persons, and without the help of any thing to be wrought in us.* Artic. 6, 8, 12. of his Charge against *Gordon, Nature of Christianity*, p. 70, 71, 72.

And why now I should be accused by *G. Keith* or his Advocate, for the words before to *R. G.* as if I *denied* Christ to appear in, or to have *a Bodily Existence* or Being, I see no just Cause, but rather that *G. K.* does therein (as in many other things) interfere with himself and his own former Testimony, which is directly agreeable to what I have said, and more severe and positive, as in his *Help in time of need*, p. 78, 79. In these words, *viz.*

'And now whether ye will hear or forbear, this I do declare unto you, in the 'Name and Power, and Authority of 'the living God, the day of the Lord is 'of a truth broken up among us, and ye 'shall look till your Eyes fail you, and rot 'within your Eye-holes, e're ever you see 'another day, *or appearance of Jesus Christ* 'to your comfort, than what we the People of the Lord called Quakers, do wit-

'ness

'neſs come, and yet more abundantly com-
'ing, and if ye will not hear, my Soul
'ſhall mourn for you in ſecret places, and
'weep before the Lord on your behalf.

Quere, Was this to deny Chriſt to have any Bodily Being? If *G. K.* may be cleared herein, I may be clear from and againſt his own Judgment unduly given upon me.

I ſee no *vehement* (or any) denyal of Chriſt's being either Bodily (or Spiritually) at God's right hand, as I am accuſed, p. 3. by Queſtioning the Words and Terms of *R. G.* 'What Scripture proof has he for
'theſe words, That *Chriſt exiſteth* outward-
'ly bodily without us at God's right hand?
'And what, and where is God's right hand?
'Is it Viſible or Inviſible? Within us or
'without us only? And is Chriſt the Sa-
'viour as an outward Bodily Exiſtence, or
'Perſon without us diſtinct from God; and
'on that conſideration, to be Worſhipped
'as God, yea or nay? And where doth the
'Scripture ſay, he was outwardly and bo-
'dily glorified at God's right hand? *&c.*

Theſe Queſtions are no concluſions nor any poſitive determinations, and they carry in them the reaſon thereof, namely,

1. Our then Adversary's excluding Christ as to his being out of his People and Saints, because at God's right hand; which has been the common Argument of divers of them. 2. Their neglect and opposition to Christ's inward spiritual appearance, and saving work in the heart, under pretence of his *outward and bodily Existence* at God's right hand; which expressions I did the more Question, because of the common and gross sense wherein many are apt to take them, *as a bodily Being*, like their own earthly Bodies *of Flesh and Blood*, which cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, 1 *Cor.* 15. 50. And because they commonly have opposed his being at God's right hand, to his inward and spiritual appearance, asserting the one in opposition to the other, having expressed very gross and carnal conceits of Christ's outward and bodily Existence at God's right hand; thence inferring that the true Christ *is not in Men*, which Argument and Inference I deny; the reason whereof may farther appear.

As for instance, *John Newman* whom *G. K.* and his Advocate has sided with against me, argues thus.

Christ cannot dwell in Man, for Christ is perfect Man, as well as perfect God, in his Book stiled, *The Light within*, p. 61. Again,

If

If Jesus Christ be with the Father, then he is not in Man, and this therefore is a feigned Christ and Light within, p. 47, 66, 72.

I deny the Argument, both of the first Proposition and Consequence; Christ being with the Father, or at God's right hand, is no reason or proof that he is *not in Man*.

To which I then Answered *J. N. Christ ascended*, p. 20, 21. 'Doth Christ's being 'with the Father, or at *his* right hand, 'hinder him from being in his People? 'This is gross Error, and contrary to 'plain Scripture, 2 *Cor.* 13. Know you not 'how that Jesus Christ is in you, except 'ye be reprobates; and this is neither 'a *feigned Christ*, nor a *feigned Light*, as 'Blasphemously and Scornfully he words 'it; And what doth *J. N.* think or ima-'gin concerning God, his right hand and 'being? And Christ at God's right hand, 'that he thus would exclude, limit and 'seem to confine them out of all Men? 'Doth not this oppose the Infiniteness and 'Omnipresence of God and Jesus Christ, 'and bring them under the limitation of 'finite Creatures? With much more up-on this Subject in the places Quoted.

I do not find that my Answer to *J. N.* is *a denying* Christ's outward appearance at the great day, as accused, p. 4. But ra-

ther a Queſtioning ſuch a manner of appearance, as he and others carnally expected to be ſeen with their carnal Eyes; as having declared that Jeſus Chriſt Roſe and *Aſcended Fleſh and Blood*, and thoſe that pierced him in his Body, *ſhall ſee that Body viſibly come again*. I Anſwered, 'Theſe 'are not the words of Scripture, but ad-'ded; and for Anſwer to him, I referred 'to *Rev.* 1. 7, 8, 13, 14, 16. In none of 'which is Jeſus Chriſt called (or repreſented 'as) a Body of *Fleſh, Blood and Bones*, vi-'ſibly to come again, *&c.* The words *Blood and Bones*, *G. Keith* has in recital hereof injurioufly left out in his *Groſs Error and Hypocriſie*, p. 3. And yet makes uſe of the place to defame me with *unbelief in a fundamental Doctrin of Chriſtian Faith*; and the ſame words, as Body of *Fleſh, Blood and Bones*, he has likewiſe left out in his injurious Citation and Conſtruction in his *Nar.* p. 17. He has alſo left out this following Paſſage on the ſame Subject: 'Howbeit 'His (Chriſt's) appearance ſhall be uni-'verſal, ſeen both to the Joy of the 'Righteous, and univerſal Conviction and 'Condemnation of the Wicked, who have 'rejected his Light within, and his ſaving 'appearance thereby made manifeſt; yea 'every Eye ſhall ſee him both of Good 'and Bad, both thoſe that have waited

for

'for his ſecond coming without Sin to Sal-
'vation, and they alſo which have Pierced
'and Crucified him, *&c. Chriſt Aſcended*,
Printed in 1669. p. 22, 23.

I never heard before, That 'tis a Funda-
mental Doctrin of the Chriſtian Faith, *That
Jeſus Chriſt either conſiſteth of a Body of Fleſh,
Blood and Bones, or is in ſuch a Body to come
again viſibly, to Mens carnal Eyes they now
have*; which was the very thing I Queſti-
oned in the places Quoted againſt me by
G. K. Light and Life, p. 41. Printed in
1668. And *Chriſt Aſcended*, p. 21, 22, 23.
Wherein, in the firſt, he has left out the
Queſtion, Did *John* ſee him with carnal
Eyes, on *Rev.* 1? 'And of the glory of
'the Father, wherein the Son of Man ſhall
'come, *Mat.* 16. 27, 28. *Luke* 9. 26, 27.
'*Is it viſible to the carnal Eye?* left out;
'and in the latter, after *in none of which*,
'(*i. e.* Scriptures Quoted) *is Jeſus Chriſt*
'repreſented as a Body of Fleſh, here *Blood
and Bones* are left out, which is very un-
fair, and more unjuſt, to render me an
unbeliever thereupon; like as if one ſhould
deal thus by a Quotation out of *G. K.*'s
Way caſt up, p. 131. After [*it being no more
a Body*] to leave out [*of Fleſh Blood and Bones*]
and then how would [*but a pure Ethereal or
Heavenly Body*] ſtand or co-here? which
he ſpeaks of the glorious Body of Chriſt.

he

Though I have always opposed the Gross and Carnal conceits of many about *the Resurrection*, I do not believe that Christ's glorious Body and the Saints Resurrection Bodies, (which must be like unto his,) shall be all shut up in Invisibility, so as not to be seen or known one of another; But that in Christ's Kingdom of Glory hereafter they shall as truly see and know one another, as the Angels of God in Heaven do, to whom they shall be Equal.

Note, That our present Adversary's granting, *Christ's Body to be glorified in Heaven, and* much *changed from the condition it was in upon the Cross*, p. 4. And also, *That such a gross Notion of the Resurrection, no Christian ever held, as if the Body were to rise in the same Grossness and Carnality that it has in this Life.* And that *G. K. has sufficiently explained himself, and that the Body when raised, shall be the same as to substance, but not as to the Grossness and Carnality as now; and did Illustrate it by the Chymical Extraction of Spirits out of Herbs*, &c. p. 26. As *G. K.* saith, *How much more ought we to acknowldge the Wisdom and Power of God who not only can, but will change the Bodies of the Saints from all gross and terrestrial Qualities, to be Heavenly and Spiritual; the Husk or drossy Part, (that is no more the true Body, than Dross in a lump of rich Oar of Gold is Gold) being excepted*, Gross Er. p. 13. and

and p. 9. *We muſt needs think* (ſaith he) *That Chriſt's Body was really Terreſtrial, i. e. had Terreſtrial Qualities when it was upon Earth; But now it is Heavenly endued altogether with Heavenly Qualities, as the Bodies of the Saints will be at the Reſurrection*, &c.

But to be more full and plain, obſerve what he ſaith in his *Way caſt up*, p. 131. 'That Body that was crucified on the Croſs 'at *Jeruſalem*, and is now Aſcended and Glo-'rified in Heaven, which remaineth the 'ſame in Subſtance that it was on Earth, al-'though it be wonderfully changed as to the 'Mode and Manner of its being: It being no 'more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones; 'but a pure Ethereal or Heavenly Body, 'like unto which the Bodies of the Saints 'are to be at the Reſurrection.

Now obſerve this great and wonderful change of Chriſt's glorified Body, and of the Saints Reſurrection Bodies, was not heretofore granted by our former Adverſaries, as *T. Elwood* truly obſerves, though very untruly charg'd with *horrid and ſenſleſs Imputation, and notorious Falſhood*, p. 4. for ſaying, 'It 'is well known that many of the Baptiſts, 'as well as others of other Profeſſions, do 'hold the Body of Chriſt now in Heaven, 'to be as really and materially a Body of 'Fleſh, Blood and Bones, as it was when it 'was upon the Croſs.

That

That many have ſo held both of Chriſt's glorious Body and the Reſurrection Bodies, hath been notoriouſly known to us and many others, as my ſaid Anſwer to the ſaid *Newman* partly ſhews, p. 17. 18. And our anſwers to *Tho. Hickes* and *Mathew Caffin* and *T. Grantham* rendred Chriſt's Body Heaven, ſuch a one as his *Quakers Ref.* p. 40, 41. And *Thomas Vincent* (and others) his groſs conceits may be ſeen in his *Illuſtrations about the Reſurrection*, noted in our Book entituled, *The Chriſtian Quaker*, in folio, 2d. part p. 161, 162, 163, 164, 165. &c.

The moſt that ever I diſcourſed of thoſe our former Adverſaries, have held the Reſurrection in that groſs ſenſe mentioned, by *T. E.* except *Jer. Ives*, tho' a contentious Adverſary, yet in that Point more ingenuous than moſt of his Brethren in thoſe Days. At a publick Diſpute between ſome of us and ſome Baptiſts at *Cherſey* in *Surry*, when a Queſtion about the Body of Chriſt in Heaven, was Ignorantly obtruded by *William Burnett*; his Brother *Jer. Ives* in anſwer to my ſpeaking of Chriſt's various appearances, as in divers Forms, after he roſe, ſaid, 'What change or alteration His Body might 'have, we cannot determine, nor what 'Glory he is in; for to enquire with *what* 'Body the Dead are raiſed is abſurd, *Chriſt* 'Aſcended, p. 19, 20.

Now

Now it is obſervable in our former controverſies on this Point, The Queſtion put to us was not, 'Whether the Saints ſhall 'come forth in the Reſurrection, with their 'Bodies of ſuch a Spiritual, Pure and Heavenly Extract, as to be free from all 'Carnality, Groſſneſs, Droſs, Husk and 'Terreſtrial Qualities; even ſo as no more 'to be Bodies of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, 'but Pure Ethereal or Heavenly Bodies, 'like unto Chriſt's glorious Body? According to *G. K*'s and his Advocates confeſſion. I ſay, this was not the Queſtion we controverted then: But, *whether the ſame numerical Body, of Fleſh, Blood and Bones that dies, ſhall be raiſed*? This we have objected againſt, and the *ſame Subſtance*; that is, the ſame groſs Subſtance and Bodily Exiſtence of *Fleſh, Blood and Bones*; this we have excepted againſt. But Reſurrection Bodies of ſuch a refined Extract and Celeſtial Subſtance, as is not Fleſh and Blood, but free from that Droſs and Husk, as is now propoſed, was not in controverſy, that ever I remember between us and our former Adverſaries. However *G. K.* ſhould be ſo ingenuous as to tell the People, what he means by the *ſame Body for Subſtance*, that ſhall riſe, that it is not the ſame Body of *Fleſh, Blood and Bones*; *but a pure ſpiritual ethereal heavenly extract Body*, and then ſee how

how that will take: And I think he'l gain no more popularity in that Point, than those of us he Quarrels with, without just Cause.

Otherwise 'tis very disingenuous to hide himself under general and indefinite Terms, by telling the People, the same Bodies that dye shall arise the same in Substance, and not tell them what Substance that is, that is not Flesh, Blood and Bones; for under those general Terms they may take him to mean in the common and gross sense of the same Flesh and Blood, who understand nothing of a Celestial Seed or Ethereal substance hid in these gross Bodies, or in their first Elements which they are to be dissolved into, whether in the Earth, Fire or Water, wherein many Bodies have been destroyed, dissolv'd and consum'd.

That Scripture, *Jo.* 14. 19. *Yet a little while and the World seeth me no more:* (which *G. K.* thinks he better translates, *as yet* or *not as yet*) Nar. p. 17. However I did not alledge it to prove, that *Christ has no Body at all*, as in *Nar.* p. 17. herein *G. K.* wrongs me; but that the World should see Christ no more in that manner wherein they then saw him: That which they then saw of him with their carnal Eyes, they should see no more, *i. e.* as in the Flesh. And how should they, if his glorified Body be no more *a*

Body

Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but a pure Ethereal or Heavenly Body, they muſt have other Eyes to ſee him withal, as ſuch than theſe ſame Eyes of Fleſh they now have.

Again, I am manifeſtly miſ-repreſented by *G. K. Narr.* p. 18. *As thinking all* Anthropomorphites *and* Muggletonians, *who believe that the Man Chriſt has any bodily Exiſtence in Heaven*; which was none of my Anſwer or Argument: But upon *J. Newman* excluding Chriſt out of all Men, becauſe at the right hand of God as a perſonal Being, and calling Chriſt within *only a feigned Chriſt*, as his terms were; this Argument I oppoſed, and ſtill do, as no ſufficient reaſon to exclude the true Chriſt out of all Men, and therefore gave this Anſwer, *i. e.* 'This manner of excluding 'God's right hand, and Chriſt to a limi-'tation (as wholly) out of his People in 'a *Perſonal Being*, (which are no Scripture 'Terms) ſtill implyes him to be ſuch a 'Perſonal God or Chriſt, like the *Anthro-'pomorphites*,' &c.

Now I ſay again, If any one ſhould argue in better Terms, *that Chriſt is a glorious Intelligent Being at God's right hand, without all Men, Ergo, he is not in Men, no not in believers*; I deny the Conſequence, for this is to limit the Omnipreſent God to a remoteneſs as well as Chriſt, and tends

to

to gratifie the carnal imaginations of ſuch as have formed an Idea or Imagination of God and his right hand, like a Perſon or Man remote and without all Men, under ſuch limitation as the *Anthropomorphites* did, and that according to the common ſpeaking, when we ſay *ſuch a Perſon*, we *mean ſuch a Man* whom we *call a Perſon*, (as we do a Woman alſo) and my Adverſarie's alſo more finely defining a Perſon to *be a Spirit*, p. 5. will neither help the Argument for the Baptiſt againſt us, nor amend ſome Mens carnal Imaginations of *a Perſonal God* like themſelves; for who are moſt carnal in their Thoughts about God, are moſt apt to imagin carnally of him; and ſuppoſe any ſhould argue in this Man's Terms, That Chriſt being at God's right hand, who is a Spirit, *Ergo*, not in believers or any Men, this would beſpeak as much Ignorance as the former, and more Abſurdity, to ſuppoſe God a limited circumſcribed Spirit, not Infinite nor Omnipreſent, which is to oppoſe his being the true God, as he is an Infinite Omnipreſent Spirit, Power, Life, Light and Wiſdom.

Beſides, my Animadverſion is very plain to *J. N.* in this caſe, *Chriſt Aſcended*, p. 69. 'If the indwelling of God and Chriſt be 'ſuch in his People, and the Saints in

'ſuch

'ſuch near Union and Conjunction with 'Chriſt, as the Branches with the Vine, and 'the Members with the Body; (as in con-'tradiction to himſelf he confeſſed) then 'tis falſe and a lying Imagination, to ima-'gin either Chriſt, God, and his right 'hand ſo remote as not to dwell in any 'Man, no not in their own People. And I may add, 'tis alſo contrary to God's own promiſe, to dwell *in them* and *walk in them*, and to his ſaving and upholding them by his own *right hand*. Chriſt's being ſet at God's right hand, beſpeaks his Exaltation, Dignity and Glory, obtained through his Humiliation and Sufferings, but not an excluſion of Chriſt, of God or his right hand, as if each were limitted or circumſcribed *wholly* without all Men, and as not to be in any Men, as they are in a true Spiritual and Scripture ſenſe.

p. 6. My telling *J. Horn* and *T. Moor*, 'That the Nature of Chriſt is pure, but 'theirs filthy, therefore not in Chriſt, as 'they ſaid it was, whilſt pleading for '*Sin* as their *natural Heritage during this 'life*.

This was ſimply in Oppoſition to the *Antinomian* Sin-pleaſing Notion, of their being juſtified and pure in Chriſt, when in themſelves filthy and actually Sinful, which was all one, as if I had told them,

you are not in Christ nor Heirs with him, whilst in your selves filthy and Sin your natural Heritage, which is far from any such false Notion, as that *Christ could not take on him Adam's nature, except he took on him the pollution of it.* 'Tis none of my Notion, nor intended in the Passage before, but unjustly cast upon me by *G. K. Narr.* p. 7. and his Advocate, *Satan Disrob'd*, p. 6.

To my Adversary's confidently asserting, *That* J. Faldo, *nor any other did ever oppose this, That they should Preach ONLY the Incarnation and Sufferings of Christ at* Jerusalem, *i. e. without Preaching likewise the inward operations of his Spirit in our hearts, Satan Disrob'd*, p. 7. And that if *W. P.* or *T. E.* cannot name one single Man, much less any of those Communions which he disputes against, that ever thought Christ's outward appearance would ever save them without his inward appearance in their Consciences, then against whom have they disputed? p. 8.

Answ. Yes I can name one single Man whom he has vindicated against us, (in *G. K.*'s behalf) who has both thought and said as much as, that Christ's outward Appearance and Sufferings has saved them, without his Appearance or Work in them, and that is the said *R. Gordon*, and it's

Charged

Charged againſt him, among his many other corrupt Doctrins by *G. Keith*, in my and his Book, Entituled, *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 70, 71. *Artic.* 1. That Chriſt without us upon the Croſs, hath already ſubdued all things, finiſh'd Tranſgreſſion, made an end of Sin, aboliſh'd Condemnation and Death.

Art. 8. That Redemption, Juſtification, were finiſhed and compleated in the Crucified Body in Chriſt for us, not *in our Perſons.*

Art. 12. That Redemption and all things are wrought; purchas'd for us, *without* the help of any thing to be wrought in us.

Theſe *G. Keith* Charged upon him, with many more as corrupt Doctrins. So that here was one Man, (*i. e. R. G.* and too many more) that has laid the whole Streſs and Work of Man's Salvation, *only* upon Chriſt's outward Appearance and Suffering, *without his inward appearance and operations by his Spirit in us.* Which is corrupt Doctrin and repugnant to that of the neceſſity of Regeneration, and being born again, without which no entrance into God's Kingdom.

Another Paſſage by the way I obſerve, 'Whereafter this Advocate for *G. K.* has 'repreſented *T. Ellwood*, as telling how 'little of difficulty there is in barely and 'hiſtorically believing this, (*i. e.* that 'God ſent Chriſt to dye for Sinners, and 'to reconcile God to Men by his Death) 'the common Faith of all that part of 'the World called Chriſtian ſhews, *&c.* 'p. 11. He grants, *That though that Belief alone will not do, yet that it is not ſo eaſie a matter, truly to believe this, even hiſtorically: But that 'tis a hard Task with the* Quakers, *and oppoſed by the* Socinians, (i. e. *the ſatisfaction* by Chriſt's outward Death) *and by all the* Deiſts *open Debauchees, and among the Profligate and Prophane of the meaner Rank, few if any of them do really believe it, even hiſtorically, or forget it and never think of it, otherwiſe it would have a greater influence upon them,* p. 11, 12.

He might have been ſo charitable or juſt, as to have ranked the *Quakers* among better company, and not to thus ſcandalize them, who ſincerely believe the ſacred Hiſtory of Chriſt's Death for Sinners, and Reconciliation thereby, but do experience the influence and fruit thereof, by his holy Spirit, according to their growth in Grace, who faithfully follow him in his Light. The Paſſage I am to obſerve (as his

his Reaſon for what goes before) follows, *viz.*

For the Hiſtorical Faith muſt be inſeparable from the ſaving Faith, and indeed the ſaving Faith is the Hiſtorical throughly digeſted and applyed, p. 12.

Which is to conclude that none have the ſaving Faith, but thoſe who have the Hiſtorical; conſequently, that all muſt be damned who have not the hiſtorical Faith of Chriſt dying for Sinners, whereby he has at once condemned all Nations or Peoples, both Infants dying in Innocency, and all others who have not the Hiſtory or hiſtorical Faith of Chriſt's ſufferings and Death, tho' it was really for mankind in general, and may and doth for ought he knows influence many who have not the hiſtorical Faith or knowledge thereof, otherwiſe the univerſal good and end thereof intended for all, is fruſtrated, to many thouſands for want of the Hiſtory or Preaching of Chriſt's Death to them; unleſs *G. K.* can demonſtrate and reſolve, that the twelve Revolutions of humane Souls will make it all up: That all that are Deceaſed or have Dyed without the hiſtorical Faith or Knowledge of Chriſt Crucified, ſhall return and have opportunity to have Chriſt ſo Preached unto them; which he has no divine Revelation for, but rather a long exploded Hypotheſis or Suppoſition,

(as in the first part Heathenish) and therefore the more difficult Task to give any certain demonstration of the same.

'Tis farther observable, what uncertainty as well as inconsistency, this Advocate for *G. K.* is in, even in this Point. He saith, *viz. How God will deal with the good moral Heathen, who never heard of Christ, I will not determine, nor enter into the Secrets of Providence*, p. 12. When he has determin'd already, that if they have not the historical Faith, they have not the saving Faith, if they be inseperable as he has asserted: For 'tis certain without some saving Faith, they cannot be saved, as without Faith it is impossible to please God.

But he appears as pinching and partial, in his following objection against the Light, as he is uncharitable in the Premises, *viz.*

But that they, (i. e. the good moral Heathen) *have the Christian Faith by believing their Light within, Or that there is any object of the Christian Faith without the outward Jesus who suffered at* Jerusalem, *is a Quakers Dream, and opposite to the whole Tenure of the Gospel*, p. 12.

Hence observe. 1. This is to deny the Gentiles any Christian Faith, who believe in the Light given them according to God's promises to them; yea though they be *good moral*

moral Men, who ſo believe, as if they could be good or pious without any Chriſtianity in them: Which is to oppoſe the bleſſed end of Chriſt being ſo given for a Light of the Heathen, and Salvation to the ends of the Earth. 2. It is to deny the Light of Chriſt, or Chriſt as the Light within, to be any object of the Chriſtian Faith; contrary to Chriſt's Doctrin: *Believe in the Light that ye may be the Children of the Light.* 3. The laſt part of the Objection implies, that either Chriſt as without, and Chriſt as within is divided, or that there are two Chriſts, an outward Chriſt, and an inward Chriſt, whereas there is but one Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And his Light within cannot be without or divided from him, who is the Fountain of Light and Life. 4. 'Tis not oppoſite (but according) to the Tenour of the Goſpel, to believe in the Light or Word of Faith, (*i. e.* Chriſt as within nigh in the Heart;) which hath both Law and Goſpel, Judgment and Mercy in it to Miniſter, ſuitable to Mens ſtates and conditions. And in this Light or Word, we meet with the great Ends, Benefits, or Fruit of Chriſt's ſuffering and Mediation, which are manifeſt and come to be fulfilled in all, who truly believe in and obey the ſame Word, whereby the Goſpel is preached in every Creature under Heaven, yea even in many

thouſands of Souls who have not the outward Hiſtory of Chriſt's ſuffering and Death*; tho' both the ſacred Hiſtory and ſincere Preaching thereof by the Spirit of Chriſt, be of great uſe and advantage, and in no wiſe to be rejected where God is pleas'd to afford them. But ſeeing, *He that believes not in the Son of God is condemned already, and the wrath of God abides upon him, becauſe he obeyeth not the Son of God*, John 3. 18. conſequently the Son of God is offered unto all, and his Grace is given and appears unto all mankind that they may believe in him and thereby lay hold on him for Life and Salvation. Chriſt plainly gives the reaſon of Mens condemnation when he there ſaith, *This is the Condemnation that Light is come into the World, and Men loved Darkneſs rather then Light, becauſe their Deeds were Evil*, John 3. 19. Otherwiſe to repreſent God to condem and bring his Wrath upon Men, for not believing in that they never had, or which was never afforded nor appeared unto them.

This were Blaſphemouſly to render God Unjuſt, Unmerciful and moſt cruel to Condemn and bring his Wrath upon Men for an Impoſſibility; for how ſhould they believe in, or obey the Son of God, if no ſaving Grace or Power of believing be afforded unto them? This were like as to bind their

Hands

hands and feet, and lock all Food from them, and then bid them walk and work or elſe ſtarve. But our good God is no ſuch hard Maſter, who willeth not the Death of Sinners, but rather their return to him that they may live, and for this end hath ſent his Son to be the Saviour of the World.

As for innocent Infants, or little Children who dye in Innocency, Divine Providence has provided for their ſafety, by Chriſt Jeſus, his Meditation and Seed of eternal Life in them; and *their Angels*, who ſee the face of God continually, are ready to carry their Souls into the Heavenly Kingdom, when they dye in that State.

My objecting againſt *W. Burnet*, about the Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed on the Croſs, was firſt and chiefly, upon his holding, That the ſhedding *of the Blood of Chriſt upon the Croſs, that was let out by* vertue *of the Spear being thruſt into his ſide, to be meritorious, or the meritorious cauſe of Man's Juſtification*, which his Brother *Ives* could not ſtand by him in; but ſuppoſed a meaning for him. Secondly, That the ſame Blood that was ſhed, doth *both purge and ſprinkle their Conſciences, ſanctifie and juſtifie* them, and yet that 'tis *not in Being*, but cumpared to *a price loſt*, as more at large

in

in my Anſwer, *Light and Life*, p. 7, 8. & p. 64. together with their contradictions about it, referring to *W. Burnet*'s Book and their Diſcourſes. But now to excuſe his ſaying, *That Blood is not in Being*, this Advocate will have it, *that he only gives way to this ſuppoſition of the* Quakers, *by way of Conceſſion, not as his own Opinion*, p. 16. 'Tis a wonder the Man's not aſhamed to uſe ſuch a ſlim come off and falſe cover for him, when 'twas a real Confeſſion, and not forced from him as a meer Conceſſion for Argument ſake, why ſhould he compare it then to *a price loſt*? And another Baptiſt, *Thomas Brown*, confeſs'd that the *Blood that was ſhed, is not in Being, it ſunk into the ground*, Light and Life, *p.* 66.

The occaſion of my Queſtioning them ſo much about this matter, was becauſe they ſeem'd to place the great ſtreſs of Man's Salvation upon the outward Blood of Chriſt and the act of *ſhedding* of it, as if it were the preſent agent operating in them, *Purging, ſprinkling their Conſciences, Sanctifying and Juſtifying*, without making the Spirit the Operator or Efficient thereof; whereas both Sanctification, waſhing and cleanſing from Sin, Regeneration, Juſtification, and ſo Salvation, are more principally aſcribed to the Spirit, the Grace, the

the Word of God, yea, to Chriſt himſelf, than to *the act of ſhedding* that Blood, or to that Blood it ſelf; yet I never oppoſed that as being a part of the Sacrifice of Chriſt, offered for Sinners, in order to a Pacification, Attonement and Reconciliation. And farther, to his compariſon between the Baptiſts declaring the *Blood ſhed on the Croſs not in being, and the Agonies and Paſſions of Chriſt upon the Croſs, as not now in being*, I do not therefore diſſolve all the merits of his Sufferings or Death to our Juſtification thereby. I do not ſo Argue, (as implyed againſt me) that becauſe his Paſſion was Temporal and Finite, *therefore not Meritorious*; for the Merits or diſſerving on Chriſt's part, is placed upon his Obedience in humbling himſelf to Death, even to the Death of the Croſs, wherefore God hath highly exalted him, *&c.* Phil. 2. 8, 9. whoſe Exaltation and Dominion is for our Salvation, if we ſubmit to him as our Leader, Commander and King.

But my diſtinction for Argument is this, Tho' that Blood and Sacrifice were offered as a price in order to Man's Redemption, it is the Power and Spirit of Chriſt, that inwardly operates and quickens the Soul to God, purifies and ſanctifies the Conſcience, and ſo effectually ſaves

us

us from Sin and Pollution. The *Price* is already paid, but the *Work* is yet undone in many; we value the *Price*, but muſt not neglect the *Work* of our Redemption and Salvation in us; for Chriſt's Sacrifice will not ſave, juſtifie or acquit any in a State of impenitency or unbelief; they muſt know the work of his Grace and Good Spirit in their hearts unto Repentance and Obedience of Faith in Chriſt, or elſe they periſh in their impenitency and wilful unbelief, whereby they make both the Croſs and blood of Chriſt of none effect unto them.

Except a Man be regenerate and born again, he cannot ſee, nor enter into the Kingdom of God. And I conceive I am not to be blamed, much leſs ranked among Ranters (as *G. K.* has, *Narr.* p. 25.) for aſcribing the ſaving work of ſprinkling the Conſcience, ſanctifying and juſtifying principally to the inward Grace and Spirit, more than to the Blood ſhed upon the Croſs.

I ſay again, I ſee no neceſſity of *directing* Men to the *Type for the Antitype*, to *Jeruſalem* or *the Temple*, p. 17. either for Jeſus Chriſt or his Blood there, but that ſuch direction is contrary to what the Righteouſneſs of Faith ſaith, *Ro.* 10. 6, 7, 8. compared with *Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14,

14, 15. Tho' we alſo Preach Chriſt, as he was Crucified and Dyed at *Jeruſalem*, and raiſed from the Dead, and I do not ſay *that's contrary to* Ro. 10. as *G. K.* wrongs me ſeveral times over, *Narr.* p. 26, 27. But *to direct Men either to go to the material Temple at* Jeruſalem, or *to look to* Jeruſalem *for Jeſus Chriſt the Antitype of that Temple*, &c. This I deem'd contrardictory to *Ro.* 10. above quoted; but they are to turn and look to the Word of Faith nigh in the Heart, where they may Livingly find, feel and know Chriſt in *Spirit and Power*, even in the *Power of his Reſurrection*, ſo as to be enabled *both to confeſs with the Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in the Heart, that God raiſed him up from the Dead.* And *this word of Faith* and of God is confeſſed unto by *G. K.* himſelf to be the *Object* and *Foundation of true Faith*; and that this *is Chriſt in them*, and that from the ſame Scriptures I quoted, *Deut.* 30. 12, 13. *Ro.* 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. As more fully appears in his *immediate revelation*, p. 3. & p. 64, 65. Print. 1668. Therefore 'tis not to deſtroy nor *allegorize away* the *Object* of Faith, to direct People to Chriſt as the *word of Faith nigh in the Heart*, as the *Object* thereof, nor is it *Antichriſtian Doctrin*, as *G. K.* has unjuſtly

juſtly accuſed me in this Point, *Narr.* p. 27. contrary to his former confeſſions.

And ſuppoſe any one in deep diſtreſs for want of Chriſt to free and ſave him from Sin ſhould earneſtly enquire, where ſhall I find him? Whither will you direct me to find Chriſt? And one ſhould anſwer, I direct thee to *Jeruſalem, to the material Temple, to the Type for Chriſt the Antitype*; and ſhould again ſay, I direct thee to Chriſt as *above the Clouds*, and *not to Chriſt as the Light within*, and then call the Light within *an uncertain Guide*, (as the Baptiſt did whom I anſwered in this Caſe) How would this anſwer the diſtreſſed Soul? Or agree with the Teſtimony of *Moſes*, or of *Paul* the Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, *in Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14. and *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8, 9. As for what the Righteouſneſs of Faith ſaith? I ſhould rather anſwer the Queſtion according to the Teſtimony of *Moſes* and the Apoſtle, Whither ſhall I be directed to go to find Chriſt? Anſwer, *Say not in thine Heart, who ſhall Aſcend into Heaven, that is, to bring Chriſt down from above? Or, who ſhall Deſcend into the Deep; that is, to bring Chriſt again from the Dead? But what ſaith it? The Word is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth and in thine Heart; that is the Word of Faith which we Preach.* And this Word of Faith will bring thee to know the great benefit and fruit of Chriſt's Death at

Je-

Jeruſalem for thee, and the power of his Reſurrection, that thou mayeſt thereby be enabled livingly to *confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thine Heart that God hath raiſed him from the Dead*, ſo as thou mayeſt be ſaved by him. But I yet ſay, to preach Chriſt as a remote *outward Chriſt only* in oppoſition to his *Light* and *Word* of Faith within, (as in the Heart) is to keep People in unbelief, remote from the true Faith and Knowledge of Chriſt, either as without us or within us; which oppoſition ought not to be to Chriſt in either reſpect.

As concerning *Sol. Eccles* ſaying, *That the Blood that was forced out of Chriſt's Side with the Spear after he was Dead, being no more than the Blood of another Saint.* p. 19. and *Nar.* p. 28. 'Concerning which I ſaid, I do not 'make *S. E.* his Expreſſions therein an Article of our Faith, for I own that in one 'ſenſe the Blood ſhed was more than that of 'another Saint, (tho' not in the viſible matter 'of it) *more*, in that it had a peculiar ſignification for Chriſt, the one offering was the 'Man peculiarly ordain'd and appointed of 'God, both to bear the Sins of many and to 'end the many offerings under the Law, 'and in all his Example and Sufferings that 'were permitted to be laid upon him, he 'both Anſwered, Fulfilled and ended the 'outward part and adminiſtration of the

'Law

'Law and Shadows, and performed the 'Father's Will therein, and was particu-'larly Eyed and Propheſied accordingly by 'the Holy Prophets; and through all his 'ſufferings in the Fleſh he gave an univer-'ſal Teſtimony, and Conſecrated a New 'and Living way, even through the Veil, 'that is to ſay *his Fleſh*; that the way into 'the moſt Holy might be manifeſt, *Light* 'and *Life*, p. 58, 59.

In the firſt place, I did ſhew a diſlike of *S. E*'s Expreſſions before cited, in not allowing them as an Article of our Faith; tho' I was willing Charitably to improve his own explication, ſo far as it would bear a Charitable Conſtruction, with reſpect to his own declared Eſtimation of the Blood of Chriſt, it's Value and Vertue.

2dly, I ſhewed in part my eſtimation of the Blood and whole Sacrifice or Offering of Chriſt, both in reſpect to the *Bleſſed Teſtimony*, Value and Efficacy thereof; more than that of any other Saint or Saints, which manifeſtly differs from *S. E*'s Expreſſions before cited.

However, if I have not been thought plain enough in this matter, let me be allowed ſo much candor, as to be credited, in being more full and plain therein; I diſown his ſaid compariſon of the Blood of Chriſt, with that of another Saint; and believe he was not

not in the Counſel or Wiſdom of God therein, tho' I did charitably conſtrue his meaning, with reſpect to the ſincerity he had towards God, and his ſelf denying crucified Life, and Teſtimony he bore for Truth, in divers ſufferings and reſpects, (and I believe he dyed in Peace) tho' in ſome things he in his zeal was not guided in true Wiſdom, which was his own weakneſs and perſonal Failure, not juſtly chargeable on us as a People, much leſs on our Principle or belief of the Spirit of Truth; or, the infallible guidance thereof. Howbeit this Adverſary appears ſo eagerly bent againſt us as a People, that he is willing to take any occaſion to Defame and Brand us; as in this very Paſſage which he calls, *The Broad and Impious Blaſphemy* of *Sol. Eccles.* He Scornfully yet Bitterly reproaches us as a People, and my ſelf in particular, in theſe Words, *viz. There never was ſurely ſuch a Company of good natur'd forgiving People! They can ſlip over, cover and excuſe the Lewdeſt Blaſphemies in a Charitable way*, &c. *They can ſee no faults in their own Friends.* G. W. *ſays of this very Paſſage of* Sol. Eccles. *That it was ſo harmleſs as might have ſatisfied any ſpiritual or unbiaſſed Mind*, p. 21. And that this is in his *Light and Life*, before quoted *p.* 58. Wherein he notoriouſly wrongs me and perverts my Words; I did not call this very Paſ-

ſage (or compariſon of *S. E*'s) harmleſs, but his Words declaring his high eſteem of the Blood of Chriſt, and of the new Covenant which was not his compariſon of the *Blood of Chriſt* with *that* of another *Saint*, which I have diſown'd.

In my anſwer to *W. Burnet*, quoted, but lamely and partially cited, *p.* 22. 23. §. 5. I did not call *Chriſt's outward material Blood a Type of the myſtical Blood or Light within*, as my anſwer is perverted, but cloſely purſued his Argument, with exceptions which he is not cleared from by this Advocate, his Argument is this, *viz. All things under the Law in the Type were purged with Blood, and this Blood was material Blood and not myſtical; and that Blood that Chriſt ſhed in order to the effecting the Salvation of Man* muſt needs *be viſible and material Blood.*

Which is to Argue thus, that *becauſe all things under the Law were purged with material Blood, and not myſtical*, Ergo *the Blood of Chriſt which purgeth the Conſcience and Effecteth the Salvation of Men, muſt needs be Material, and not Myſtical.* I ſtill deny the inference, and my anſwer ſhews where and againſt what my Exceptions lye. The Types and Shadows under the Law, did both point at what was Material and what was Myſtical in Chriſt: If the legal Sacrifices, *were Types of Chriſt and ſo Myſtical, as is confeſs'd*

fess'd, p. 23. contrary to *Burnets* asserting them *Material, not Mystical.* As in his asserting, *That 'twas Material Blood, not Mystical, whereby all things under the Law were purged*; but now contrarywise those *Sacrifices are* granted to be *Mystical, because Types of Christ, the Substance and Mystery of them.*

My Answer to *Burnet's* Argument, even in the first part, left out by this Adversary, is plain and clear, *viz.* 'As if one 'should reason, That because the Type 'was Material, visible, and not Mystical, 'therefore the Antitype or Substance must 'needs be Material and not Mystical; by 'this all Mysteries of divine things are 'excluded from being either spiritual, the 'Antitype, or substance. Whereas it was 'the Heavenly things themselves that are 'in Christ, in which consists the sub-'stance and end of Types and Sha-'dows.

And my subsequent exceptions against the said Argument are as plain and unanswered; 'That if the Antitype was 'Matterial and Mystical, because the Type 'or Shadow was Material, then this is 'like as to argue, That because Circumcision 'which was a Type, was Material or out-'ward, therefore the Circumcision of the 'Spirit which is the Antitype of it,

'must needs be outward too, and not 'Myſtical; and thus he might as well 'reaſon touching all other Types and 'Shadows under the Law, and the Hea-'venly or good things to come Preſigur-'ed or Shadowed by them, That becauſe 'the Prieſts under the Law, (at the out-'ward Tabernacle or Temple) were Mi-'niſters of outward or Temporal things, 'Carnal Ordinances, Shadows, *&c.* There-'fore thoſe good things to come, which 'Chriſt was ſaid to be the High Prieſt 'of, muſt needs be Temporal and not 'Myſtical; which to aſſert were abſurd, '*&c.*

'And I farther proceed in my Anſwer, 'about the Heavenly and Spiritual things 'which the Law had the Shadow of, '*viz.* Whereas both the Heavenly and 'more perfect Tabernacle and Altar, with 'the Heavenly things, are all Myſtery and 'Spiritual, the Offering and living Sacri-'fices are Spiritual, the Paſſover Spiritual, 'the Seed Spiritual, the Bread, the Fruit 'of the Vine, the Oyl, the Fleſh and 'Blood which give Life to the Soul, yea, 'the Water and Blood which waſheth 'and ſprinkleth the Conſcience are Spi-'ritual and Myſterious, as the New Co-'venant it ſelf is, which they belong to, 'and theſe things known in. And this is

'the

'the New and Living way, which Chriſt 'ſet open through the vail of his Fleſh, 'Heb. 10. Let him receive this who can.

And if our Adverſary and his abetters know no more of the Myſtery of Chriſt's Blood or Work of purging and ſprinkling the Conſcience, than their profeſſion and application of the Material Blood, without the ſanctifying Spirit and Operation of it; they may remain long enough with defiled Conſciences, and full of Envy and Malice. That precious outward Offering and Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, has long been greatly abuſed by miſapplication, and the holy deſign and ends thereof perverted, by carnal Profeſſors, to indulge themſelves in Sin and Diſobedience againſt Chriſt during Life. Now laying aſide the Baptiſt's Argument aforeſaid, I do grant that the Material *Blood* (whereby all things under the Law were purged) as it had the very Image of the Material Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed, it was Typical thereof. And *that Blood of Chriſt* including his whole Sacrifice, argued by the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* as the Antitype, anſwering and fulfiling the *Types* thereof, and which were not only Types of that Blood and Sacrifice as outwardly offered, but alſo a ſhadow of the inward and ſpiritual ſprinkling, purging and ſanctifying of the Conſcience,

by Chriſt our High Prieſt, with his Blood and Spirit of Grace.

The good things to come, which the Law had the ſhadow of, but not the very Image of them, were Heavenly and Spiritual things, *Heb.* 10. 1. But the Law had the very Image or Reſemblance of the Material Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed, in that it had material Blood of Sacrifices, one Blood reſembles another; therefore that Material or Natural Blood outwardly ſhed, was not thoſe Spiritual and Heavenly things which the Law had the ſhadow, and not the very Image of.

The Material and Typical Blood whereby all things were purged under the Law was ſprinkled on them by *Moſes* and the High-Prieſt, therefore 'tis Chriſt our High Prieſt, who ſprinkles and effectually purgeth the Conſcience, which he doth not Literally, but Spiritually, in which work his Spirit and Power is livingly concerned, as the efficient Cauſe, and his Blood and whole Sacrifice in preparing and making way for, and obtaining Redemption and Remiſſion of Sins, received upon true repentance on our parts. It's ſaid, *How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt, who through the eternal Spirit offered himſelf without ſpot to God, purge your Conſciences from dead works to ſerve the living God*, Heb. 9. 14. The value,

value, efficacy and fruit of his offering himself without ſpot to God, is greatly or principally placed upon *the eternal Spirit*; and ſo is the work of Sanctification and effectually purging the Conſcience, both from dead works and the pollution of Sin. That which inwardly and effectually purgeth the Conſcience, and ſprinkles the heart from an evil Conſcience, is the Spirit, the ſpiritual Vertue Blood and Life of Chriſt, that actually purgeth and cleanſeth them from all Sin, who truly walk in his light, which has the ſanctifying life and vertue in it.

There was a kind of expiation and purging by way of Sacrifice under the Law and old Covenant, yet the Conſciences thereby not purified nor made perfect.

But the Expiation or καθαρισμον *Purgation or Cleanſing*, Heb. 1. 3 That's made and prepared by Chriſt himſelf and his Sacrifice, and the Covenant of Grace and Mercy (wherein that work of Grace is fulfiled) *Sealed* with *his own Blood*; this reacheth the Conſcience to a real purifying and perfecting thereof by the Spirit and Power of Chriſt. *By one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are Sanctified, whereof the Holy Ghoſt alſo is witneſs to us*, Heb. 10. 14, 15. Therefore that Expiation made by that moſt excellent Offering without us, is fufilled by the Spirit in the work of Sancti-

fication within us. We are delivered from the outward Law and the Curſe of it by the Body of Chriſt, but are made free from the Law and Sin of Death by the Law of the Spirit and Life in Chriſt Jeſus, *Ro.* 7. 4. & 8. 2. To that of *Act* 20. 28. *The Church of God which he purchaſed with his own Blood.*

Hereupon the Man has ſome ſlight flings at me, but makes very little work on't. As to my ſaying, *The Blood of God* (which is God's own Blood, and whereby his Church is purchas'd) *muſt needs be ſpiritual, and the Covenant of God is inward and ſpiritual, and ſo is the Blood of it*, conſequently both *Myſtical.* I did not hereby hold that God is either *Material*, or has a *Material Body* or Blood, but the contrary, that *his own Blood* whereby his Church is purchaſed is more than the Material or Natural Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed, though that was a part of the Sacrifice offered for Man's Redemption; neither dare our Adverſary ſay that Blood could be properly called *God's own Blood* (unleſs he holds that God has a *material* Body and Blood) no more than the *Annotation* thereupon, which ſaith, Of *God's own Blood, that which appertaineth to Chriſt's humanity, is attributed to his Divinity, becauſe of the Communion of properties and union of the two Natures in one Perſon.* Which Notation or the Terms of it, I ſhall not now diſpute.

But

But I'le take leave to explain my ſelf farther for the ſpiritual vertue and myſtery of *God's own Blood (and the Blood of his everlaſting Covenant, the Blood of ſprinkling therein,* &c.) *wherehy God has purchaſed his Church.*

God's own Blood, was no leſs than his *own dear* Son, Chriſt himſelf: It was a manner of ſpeaking, the Blood put for the whole Offering, the *innocent Blood* that *Judas* betrayed, was *Chriſt himſelf*, Mat. 27. 4. And the Ranſom or Price given for Man's Redemption was *Chriſt himſelf*, who came to give his life for the Ranſome of many, *Matt.* 20 28. And he gave himſelf a *Ranſome* for all Men, to be teſtified of in due time, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. God ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. There's a twofold work in the Redemption, that is by Jeſus Chriſt, 1. By *the Sacrifice* and *Mediation* of Chriſt, general for all Men. 2. By his Power, Spirit and Life, actually freeing and delivering the truly believing Soul from Sin and from the Nature and Being of Sin and Condemnation, becauſe thereof, in which ſenſe God's Church was purchaſed with his own Blood, and in which laſt and ſpecial ſenſe my Anſwer was intended, as not only by the natural or outward Blood ſhed, but principally by the ſpiritual Blood or Life of Chriſt Jeſus.

God's

God's ſparing not his own Son, but delivering him up for us all, includes the whole Sacrifice of Chriſt in Soul and Body which were offered; therefore *God's own Blood*, is ſuch an high and elegant Phraſe, as beſpeaks the great love of God in Chriſt, as the whole Ranſom and Price of Man's Redemption, both outwardly and inwardly, outwardly by the Ranſom given by Chriſt's Sufferings and Sacrifice, and inwardly, by the operation of his Life, Power and Spirit, which Myſtically is that precious Blood, that is oppoſed to all corruptible things, which redeems from the vain Converſation, from all Iniquity, and effectually waſheth and cleanſeth us from our Sins, purgeth and ſprinkles our Conſciences, *&c.*

And farther, to Anſwer to Types and Shadows under the Law, of ſhedding Blood and ſprinkling, *&c.* That God according to his Mercy ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, which he *ſhed* on us abundantly, through Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour, *Titus* 3. 5, 6. And I'le ſprinkle clean water upon them, and waſh them from all their filthineſs, ſaith the Lord.

And the Blood of ſprinkling which the ſpiritual believers were come unto, has the ſame effect.

And

And if the name of *Water* be attributed to the Spirit, as it is, *Jo.* 7. 38, 39. *Light and Life*, The name of *Blood* may alſo; which is not to Allegorize away or invalidate the outward Blood or Sacrifice of Chriſt, or any part thereof; yet the Myſtery thereof, we may not deny, but confeſs. And according to the anſwers I have given for the Blood of Chriſt, and the Myſtery thereof, our deceaſed Friend and Brother *Robert Bercley* expreſly agrees, whoſe Teſtimony therefore I am the more willing to cite, becauſe *G. Keith* has approved of his Works, p. 60. *R. B*'s Teſtimony in his Works, p. 10. follows in theſe words, *viz.*

'This Blood (ſpeaking of the Blood of 'Chriſt that is healing, *&c.*) is known 'and felt within to waſh and purge the Con-'ſcience; for Chriſt as he is within is not 'without his Blood which is Spiritual, e-'ven the pure Blood of the *Vine*, and is 'that Wine of the Kingdom which is *in-'wardly* felt to waſh and to refreſh, which 'he gives to them who know not diſtinctly 'the outward ſhedding of his Blood, as it 'was many hundred years ago, and which 'many are ignorant of, who have heard 'much of the outward ſhedding of his Blood, 'but know not the *Blood* as ſhed and pou-'red forth *in them*, to ſprinkle their Con-'ſciences from dead Works; for it is *a My-*

'*ſtery*,

'ſtery, ſealed up from all who ſtand in op-
'poſition to his *Light within.* But there
'mark thy own Words (ſaith he to his Op-
'ponent) The Plaſter muſt be applyed er'e
'the Sore be healed. Muſt not then *ſaving*
'*Grace* be applyed er'e the Soul be Convert-
'ed or Healed?

And *R. B.* treats much more largely concerning the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, to the ſame purpoſe as before cited; for the Blood of Chriſt, as 'tis Spiritual and Myſterious *&c.* p. 494. 495. 496, 497, 498. upon his thirteenth Propoſition of his Apology, and in page 494. He has recourſe to *Auguſtin*, viz.

'§ 11. The *Body* then of Chriſt which
'Believers partake of, is Spiritual, and not
'*Carnal*; and his Blood which they Drink
'of, is *Pure* and *Heavenly*, and not *Humane*
'or *Elementary*; as *Auguſtin* alſo affirms,
'*Pſ.* 98. *Except a Man Eat my Fleſh he hath*
'*not in him Life Eternal:* And he ſaith, *The*
'*Words which I ſpeak unto you are Spirit and*
'*Life, underſtand ſpiritually what I have ſpo-*
'*ken: Ye ſhall not Eat of* this Body *which ye*
'*ſee, and Drink this Blood which they ſhall*
'*ſpill that Crucifie me. I am the living Bread*
'*which have deſcended from Heaven; He cal-*
'*led himſelf the Bread who deſcended from Hea-*
'*ven, exhorting that we ſhould believe in him,*
'&c.

Unto

Unto which I further add for Illuſtration, *That the pure Blood of Grapes* promiſed to *Judah* and *Iſrael*, Gen. 49. 11. *Deut* 32. 14. was Typical of this ſpiritual Blood and Fruit of the Heavenly Vine Chriſt Jeſus, which truly relieves and comforts the afflicted and ſorrowful Soul that comes unto him.

And alſo the *Milk* and *Honey*, the *Butter*, *Oyl*, and *Wheat*, and other Temporal Bleſſings which were in the promiſed Land, were all Types of Chriſt and the ſpiritual Bleſſings received in him, in his Kingdom and Heavenly Canaan.

And *the Oyl and Wine* whichthe Compaſſionate *Samaritan* poured into the Wounds (of the Man that was wounded by Thieves and left half Dead) *Luke* 10. 34 were alſo Typical of the healing Vertue, Life and ſpiritual Blood of Chriſt Jeſus, which he graciouſly poureth into many wounded Souls.

As concerning the word *Perſonality* and *Perſonal Exiſtence*, as applyed to *God* and *Chriſt*; I have ſometimes queſtioned, as alſo the word *Humane*, as aſcribed to the glorified Body of Chriſt, (which is ſpiritual) and alſo to his Soul or Spirit, for theſe reaſons. 1. Becauſe impoſed on us by ſome Adverſaries without Scripture proof of thoſe terms, and not to Queſtion Chriſt's glo-

glorious *Manhood*; (for in that ſenſe I admit of, and ſometime may uſe the word *Humanity*; either for *Man*, or for the Good Nature and diſpoſition of Man, as of the word *Trinity* for *Three*, being not willing to maintain conteſt about Words, but to mind the thing intended thereby.) 2. Becauſe falſe Arguments have been drawn thence againſt Chriſt and his Light in Man. 3. Becauſe of the carnal Imaginations of too many thereof, who under pretence of expecting Chriſt to come again in the Fleſh, in the ſame manner as he was on Earth, and to be ſeen with their carnal Eyes, neglect the introverſion of their Minds to Chriſt's inward appearance in Spirit. 4. Becauſe whilſt Men feed upon ſuch Notions and Imaginations of Chriſt, excluding him out of their Hearts, they exclude the living and Heart-purifying Faith of Chriſt, ſo that their Faith is but Dead and Fruitleſs, whilſt ſuch ſeem to adore Chriſt as only an *outward Chriſt*, or as *wholly without them*, and *not in them*, inſtead of opening the Door of their Hearts unto him to let him in, they harbour and indulge their own Corruptions, Pride, Scorn, Envy and Covetouſneſs, *&c.* in their Hearts, out of which proceed all theſe bitter Reproches, Revilings and Calumnies, which we meet with this Day, as heretofore.

In

In all my former queſtioning their unſcriptural terms (who profeſs the Scriptures to be their only Rule) aſcribed to God and Chriſt, I never deſigned to deny his being *our Mediator* as *Man*, nor to oppoſe his coming in Power and great Glory, in his glorified ſpiritual Body, to Judge the Quick and the Dead in the laſt Day; tho I have ſometimes ſhunned controverſy on that Point, and about the *Reſurrection* and *laſt Day* of Judgment; Urging not to put the day of the Lord afar off, nor to neglect the preſent day of their Viſitation and Judgment of Chriſt, by his Spirit and Light within them.

The Queſtion how are the Dead raiſed and with what Body come they forth, I have often waved as unneceſſary as well as unwarrantable, being reprehended in ſome, 1 *Cor.* 15. 35, 36. I being willing to acquieſce in the will of God in that matter, to give a Body as it pleaſeth him, and to every Seed its own Body as proper thereunto, *ver.* 38.

One thing I would be better underſtood in, Not having fully explained a Paſſage in that Book, *Chriſt Aſcended*, Pref. and *p.* 67. 'Where 'tis implied that we do not affirm 'Chriſt is in every Man, or that every 'Man hath the Son, but a meaſure of his 'Light, Grace or Heavenly Gift in all.

Where-

Whereby is meant Christ in his fulness is not in any Man, nor revealed in every Man, nor is every Man in Christ.

Neither is Christ in every Man, as he is in them in whom *the Body is Dead because of Sin*, Rom. 8. 10. But as *a Light*, as an Immortal *Seed*, as the *Word*, he is in some degree in every Man, but every Man is not in Christ as the new Creature is, and all true Believers who walk in his Light, are in him, and he in them.

And for our endeavours to draw Peoples Minds off, from their carnal expectations of Christ's outward coming again in the Flesh; or from resting upon a fleshly knowledge of him as come in the Flesh without them only, that their Minds may be turned to his Light and Grace within them, to know his Power and Work in them.

This cannot be truly deemed any *Antichristian* Doctrin or Ministry, and we are sure *G. K.* did not so deem it heretofore, but the contrary; see his *Help in time of need*, p. 22. 'This is the Antichrist who denies 'Christ the Son come thus in the Revelati-'on of himself in the Heart, for that come-'ing of Christ in his Bodily appearance at '*Jerusalem*, Antichrist will not, does not 'deny it, being he knows it will never 'harm his Kingdom, so to confess him come, 'provided Christ's Kingdom be not set up 'in the Heart. So

So that Antichriſt's work now-a-days, is to oppoſe Chriſt's ſpiritual Coming and Kingdom; and yet pretend to own his coming in the Fleſh: Yet this greater ſubtility of *Antichriſt's* work now than formerly, will not cover his evil deſigns; but the true Seed Chriſt will prevail, and his Power reign over that Spirit of Antichriſt, and Son of Perdition. Glory to God, and to the Lamb that ſitteth upon the Throne.

Some of the Author to the Snake in the Graſs, *his notorious Lyes and Perverſions, gleaned out of his ſaid Book,* Satan Diſrob'd.

1. p. 20. *That they* (i. e. Quakers) *have thrown off the Baptiſm of his* (i. e. Chriſt's) *Death, having renounced the benefit of his Death it ſelf.*

Note, Which are both falſe; Chriſt's Baptiſm into his Death, and the benefit thereof are very precious to us.

2. p. 24. *That G. W. makes the Righteousness of God to be of the same kind and nature with ours, which is Blasphemy.*

Note, This is not true: *Christ*, who is made of God unto us Righteous, hath brought us to deny our own Righteousness.

3. p. 28, 29. *That heavenly Body which they* (i. e. Quakers) *talk of, most of them understand nothing by it, but the Soul it self, or an heavenly frame or disposition of the Soul, which they think they have attained already.*

Note, These are not true, the *heavenly Resurrection Body* is not the Soul it self, but a Body which God giveth as it pleaseth him.

4. p. 29. *Innumerable instances might be given of lying Prophesies, the rankest Treasons and Blasphemies pronounced in the name of the Lord.* And this against the Quakers, these are outragious Aspersions and Slanders.

5. p. 30. *That the coming* (i. e. of Christ) *to the future judgment, this he* (i. e. G. W.) *utterly denies.*

I take this to be an utter Falshood: I am not conscious of such denyal, by my questioning such a manner of coming again in the Flesh, as they carnally expected, to see with their carnal Eyes, who I answered about this point.

6. p. 30.

6. p. 30. *That they mean that there is no visible coming of Christ, to be now looked for outwardly. What they mean by a glorified heavenly Body, not any thing either visible or intelligible.*

This is not true: The coming of Christ to Judgment in the great and last Day, will be both seen and understood, and so will the glorified Bodies of his Saints, I really believe.

Pray observe what a storm of furious Rayleries and Falshoods this Author to the *Snake*, &c. vents against us and other Dissenters, as followeth, *viz.*

7. p. 33. *The Year 1650. when our new Light arose in our Hemisphere, when (the Church being pull'd down) the vilest and most monstrous and numerous Spawn of Multifarious Sects, that ever the bottomless Pit spew'd forth at once, were with a thousand other Devils let loose among us! a just punishment for our Schism and Rebellion: And we are yet left to War with the Tayl of this Hydra, which is gathering new life, and if it should (for our Sins) prevail, our last State would be worse than the first. Who can refrain from indignation, to see such a conceited, senseless, most ignorant and blasphemous Crew, destitute of common modesty or shame, wipe their mouths, and gravely set up themselves above all the glorious Light of the Church Confessors and Martyrs, ever since the*

Apoſtles, whom they damn as Apoſtates. [Which is a groſs Lye.]

I forbear Anſwer to theſe Paſſages, becauſe of the groſneſs, outrage, ralery and notorious Falſhood thereof.

8. p. 34. *Denial of theſe four great Eſſentials* (ſo call'd) 1. *Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered at* Jeruſalem *to our Salvation.* 2. *Juſtification by his Blood outwardly ſhed.* 3. *The Reſurrection of the Dead.* 4. *The future Judgment*, unjuſtly charged (and perverſions alledged for proof.) 'Tis miſconſtruction and miſ-application of Chriſt's *Sufferings* and *Blood* without the *Spirit* and Operation thereof within, that we deny and not the real living *Faith* in Chriſt, concerning any of theſe Points, which his *Spirit* reveals according to holy Scripture.

9. p. 35. He ſaith, *And it is an horrible ſcandal that ſuch ſhould be ſuffered under the name Proteſtant.*

As 'tis the People called Quakers, he chiefly ſmites at; this appears to us a bold reflection upon the Government, for ſo eſteeming and recognizing the ſaid People by Law, as being Proteſtants.

'Whereas *G. F.* Queſtion'd about the 'Soul, partly in the Terms of his Adverſary, 'i. e. Is not that a part of God and of his 'Being, which came out from God? (*viz.* 'the Breath of Life) God breathed into 'Man

' Man the breath of Life, and he became a living Soul, *gr. myst.*

This I have more fully spoken to before, and I see no great cause the Man has to quarrel with the Passage, if rightly quoted [only the words *part of God*, may seem somewhat uncouth, but they were first an Apostle's words, and admitted of as from him. The breath of Life, which God breathed into Man, whereby Man became a living Soul was intended by *G. F.*]

Seeing he who now quarrels with us, confesseth, *Man's Soul was breathed from God, and made a glorious Image of him, and partook of many excellencies and endowments which were communicated by God unto it, all this the usual opinion doth ascribe to the Soul*, p. 40. of *Satan Disrob'd*, That *Man's Soul was* Breathed *from God*, &c. I think this Confession, and that we are his Off-spring, *Act.* 17. 28. is much of the same import, or near as high as what *G. F.* said or intended, if rightly considered; and therefore this opposer might have spared his many Reflections in this Point.

Some gleanings of Lyes, Slanders and Perversions, out of the Some Gleanings *of the Author to* the Snake in the Grass, *returned and recharged upon him; with brief Remarks upon them.*

1. *GReat Ignorance* charg'd on the *generality of the Quakers, and that many of them do at this day plainly own the most Blasphemous nd Heretical Doctrins, that have been objected against them. And that such Heresies have been taught among them, and are still so understood by their People, and that vehemently,* p. 1, 2.

These superlative Charges of *Blasphemous Heresies*, as own'd and taught among the said People, are denyed as most gross Calumnies and Abuses against them.

2. *That a present Preacher of theirs,* (i. e. Quakers) *in this very Year being pressed to acknowledge the Man Christ without us, and the necessity of Faith in him. Answered, The Man Christ, a F——rt. Horrid!*

This

This we ſuſpect, and queſtion the Truth of it, however we deny the expreſſion with abhorrence, and the unjuſt injurious improvement he makes of it, and the ſubſequent ſtories, as

3. *That the ſaid Preachers of the Quakers denyed that Chriſt's body roſe out of the Grave, that our bodies ſhould riſe, that there would be any general Judgment, for that the Scriptures were all true.* The improvement made of theſe ſtories queſtioned by us, is, *This is a Teacher, thus he has been Taught, and thus he Teaches others. And it is no wonder, that they who are thus Taught, to believe no outward Chriſt now in being, ſhould uſe him with the utmoſt contempt, and his Worſhippers with the greateſt ſeverity, as being the groſſeſt ſort of Idolaters to worſhip a dead God*, p. 2.

Note, 1. We queſtion the Truth of the particular ſtories, and deny that the Quakers have, or own any ſuch Preachers, as are juſtly chargeable with ſuch contempt of the Man Chriſt without us, or denyal of his Reſurrection or general Judgment. 2. We neither own nor know, any ſuch Doctrin among us, as to deny any outward Chriſt, or Chriſt without us now in Being, or to uſe him with contempt. Theſe we look on as groſs Lyes, which ſeem ſomewhat generally to affect us as a People, *i. e.* the Quakers, their Faith in an inward

Christ, *viz.* their Light within, being thereupon reflected on, as in opposition to the Man Christ without; when he can neither demonstrate nor disprove their Light, nor their Faith therein.

4. *That they* (i. e. the Quakers) *reckon their own Blood to be the Blood of Christ, and to be that Blood, which cleanseth from Sin*, p. 3. Which is a gross Falshood.

5. *Their* (i. e. the Quakers) *frequent Idolatries to* G. F. *giving him the Titles and Attributes of God, falling prostrate before him, and adoring him with these Appellations, Thou art the Son of the everlasting God, the King of Israel, all Nations shall worship thee*, &c. p. 3.

We question these stories, we denying all Idolatry, and all such Attributes and Adoration to any Mortal.

6. *That the Quakers had vilely cast away the great Fundamentals of the Christian Religion*, p. 5.

7. *The Quakers falsly charged with rage against* G. K. *p.* 5. Which are both vile Lyes.

8. *That they are forced at last to a feigned complyance with the Doctrin that he Teaches*, i. e. *by the Truths which he contends for prevailing against them.*

Which

Which is falſly ſtated againſt us, the Truth's prevalency upon us, has not been by his contradiction, neither can we own all for Truth which he contends for. His great inſtability, and late contradictions to his former and latter Teſtimonies, both in behalf of the People called Quakers and their Principles are very Notorious to every rational perſon, that reads the Collections thereof, in *Tho. Elwood*'s, *John Pennington*'s (and others) Anſwers and Replies to him.

9. *A Blaſphemous bantring Paper*, (he tells of *i. e. G. F.*'s) *turning the Chriſt to the Light within, which will bring you off all the Worlds teachers and ways*, &c. but ſhews not wherein the Blaſphemy is.

And we know no ſuch Phraſe as turning the Chriſt to the Light within, but that Chriſt is the Light of the World, *&c.*

10. *If he* (i. e. *W. Rogers*) *had ſaid Chriſt was no more than another Man, he had come off and been excuſed by the whole fraternity and reverenced, as well as* Sol. Eccleſ. *p.* 8. [What a Lying imagination and groſs piece of Forgery is this!]

They (i. e. Quakers) *refrained not to Print and Publiſh every day, moſt virulent Invectives againſt other Proteſtants, and diſpers'd them by order of the yearly Meeting*, p. 9. Theſe are notorious Lyes.

12. *That*

12. *That the Quakers are not concerned at the intollerable and blasphemous contempt of the holy Bible*, (which he charged a *prophane Papist* A. S. withal, as calling that Book, *their unjust, corrupt and perverse Bible*) which was grosly Blasphemous indeed, but then unjustly to hang this upon the Quakers. He says J. Cole *declares*, *That they are not at all concerned*. He insults,

This is a strange story and incredible, That ever *Jos. Cole* insulted in any such Blasphemous contempt of the Protestant Bible, as to our being not at all concerneth, so we are not in any such contempt; no, far be it from us.

Josiah Cole is so far from joyning with the said A. S. that he Writes in Testimony against him, by way of an Answer to his Pamphlet, as finding him therein smiting at the People called Quakers, and endeavouring to render them odious, by affirming, *That they are led by a deluding Spirit*, &c. So that *Josiah Cole* had no reason to joyn with him, or take his part against any Sincere Protestants, *Whore unvail'd*, p. 57.

Our Accuser proceeds farther upon the said story, which he would turn upon the Quakers, *viz.*

13. p. 9, 10. *Now why should these Men be reputed Protestants, they count themselves none of us, who are not concerned on our part,*

no,

no, not against the Church of Rome; *but draw their Arms against us, who joyn with them, not only against our Ministers, but our Bibles.* [Here are Lyes, and groſs Calumnies accumulated againſt us] *Why ſhould theſe be reputed as Chriſtians? Can they be Chriſtians who Blaſpheme the Bible?* *Anſwer.* No, but theſe are horrid and groſs ſlanders againſt the Quakers, who have approved themſelves both better Proteſtants and Chriſtians than their Perſecutors, and ſuch a Perſecuting, Sculking Adverſary as this our Accuſer, who ſeems ſtrenuouſly to ſeek our ruin, by endeavouring to murther our Chriſtian and Civil Reputations; but to us it is no more than the hiſſing of *The Snake in the Graſs*, or like one that whiſpers out of the ground. And his next Charge is alſo groſly falſe, as 'tis intended againſt us, *viz.*

14. *Surely their Light within is Darkneſs, who joyn with the moſt ignorant and bigotted of the Romiſh Emiſſaries againſt our Bible*, p. 10.

Quere, When, or where, do the Quakers ſo joyn with thoſe Emiſſaries? I take this to be a moſt groſs and foul piece of Forgery and Calumny.

15. Our Accuſer gives high, and ſuperlative commendations of *John Pennyman, as an ancient, worthy and* moſt *ſincere honeſt Gentleman, who* (he ſays) *had been inveigl'd with their falſe ſhew and pretences to Piety, remained zealous*

ous in their Communion, and ſuffered with them, till he diſcovered the groſſeſt Immoralities among them, lying, cheating and foul uncleanneſs, which having complained of, and otherwiſe repreſented to their ſuperiours, tho' the fact could not be denyed, yet they would not cenſure any that continued in their Unity, for which reaſon, he (after long ſtruggling with them, to amend their ſcandalous vices) at laſt left them, p. 10.

As his Character of the ſaid *J. P.* in the ſuperlative degree, appears a piece of flattery, inſincere and unmerited, his ſcandalous ſtories on his behalf, and reaſon of his leaving us, appear neither true nor impartial: I never heard of any undeniable proof of the matter of fact from *J. P.* and I am ſorry, that in his old Age, he ſhould give ſuch occaſion to ſuch malicious, perſecuting Adverſaries as this, to reproach us, in this manner, as if we did indulge and hold unity with ſuch Perſons *guilty of the groſſeſt Immoralities, lying, cheating and foul uncleanneſs.* Will *J. Pennyman* adventure to ſtand by theſe ſtories and aggravations againſt us? I queſtion it: And he knows better the reaſon of his leaving us, than the account before, and what offence he took at our Friends Paper, that was publiſhed to clear us from the great Offence and Reproach he gave by his notorious unwarrantable attempt

tempt at the Exchange, and how he was committed thereupon, I am not willing now to repeat it upon him. I would not have him think that I am in any Revenge or *Rage* againſt him (as we are unjuſtly charged) neither would I have him dye in enmity or uncharitableneſs againſt us. And ſuppoſe he has eſpied out any particular miſcarriages, that's no juſt cauſe of his leaving our Communion, much leſs of turning open Enemy againſt us: Or if ſuch miſcarriages have not been judicially proved before thoſe called our Superiors, their not Cenſuring the parties accuſed to Excommunication, for want of ſuch proof, was no juſt cauſe of his leaving our Communion, or turning Adverſary to defame us.

16. *That we recommend the moſt virulent of* Rome's *invectives againſt the Proteſtants and their Bible too*, p. 10. Is a groſs Falſhood; we know no ſuch Recommendation.

17. *How tame is the Church of* England *that ſuffers* Fox's *Journal to be newly Printed and preſented to the Univerſity of* Oxford, *and many other of the Quaker Prophets to be printed*, &c. p. 11. Which unjuſtly implies ſome great Crime and Iniquity in the ſaid Journal, and a great offence to this Perſecutor, that we are not held under ſevere Reſtraint and Perſecution, that he and ſuch perſecuting Incendiaries may have liberty without controul to Aſperſe

and

and Misrepresent us, and we none to defend our Innocency, which is high Injustice.

18. *That the Quaker Prophets cast the utmost contempt upon the Person of Jesus our God*, p. 11. Which is a most odious Calumny.

19. *That by the Register of their Sufferings (i.e. Quakers) they hope to make their Sufferings for the Truth (as they call it) to exceed all the Ten Persecutions; and to be more undeserv'd than the Sufferings of Christ himself, or of the Apostles*, p. 11. These are gross and notorious false Suggestions, we have no such hopes. He cites *E. B.* unfairly and partially in this Point, and yet the Comparison about the Sufferings of the People of God in this Age, *as greater or more unjust* than in the Days of Christ, or the Apostles, or since, is a mistake, we shall not stand by the Comparison, whether 'twas so first verbally stated by *E. B. himself*, or by some mistake since, I shall not undertake to determin, unless I see his original Copy. However we are clear'd from either magnifying our Sufferings above Christ's or his Apostle's, *&c.* For we do prefer Christ's Sufferings before all other Mens, and that he was wholly Innocent, and unduly and unjustly Prosecuted and put to Death by wicked Hands, who were justly charged with Murther therein. This Point is farther cleared on our parts, in *The Quakers*

hers Vindication against F. Bugg's *Calumnies*, p. 2. *Col.* 1. One Sheet. But I think this Author of *The Snake in the Graſs* has more juſtified the Act of Chriſt's Perſecutors and Murtherers (and conſequently undervalued his Innocency in his Sufferings) than ever the Quakers did, where he reflects upon *G. Whitehead*'s Argument, *That Killing of Chriſt outwardly being the Act of wicked Men, could be no meritorious Act*, Satan Diſc. Glean. *p.* 5. This he retorts as my Argument, but does not anſwer or refute it, and I am of the ſame mind ſtill, that the *Merit*, and what was *Meritorious* was in Chriſt's Obedience and Humility in his ſuffering to Death; and not in the Act of wicked Men in Killing and Murthering him, *Acts* 7. 52 & *Acts* 2. 23. And if this Adverſary be of the contrary opinion let him ſpeak out and plainly tell us, if he believes that the Act of wicked Men in Murthering the Juſt *one*, was a *meritorious* Act.

20. *Many of them* (i. e. Quakers) *ſuffer'd (not ſo much as they deſerved) for open and notorious Blaſphemy*, p. 12. Which is a groſs Calumny and Scandal, undeſervedly caſt upon them, and is a plain indication of this Accuſer's great malice, cruelty and perſecuteing Spirit.

21. *That*

21. *That the hardſhip of Impriſonments (which many of the poorer ſort of them* (i. e. Quakers) *did ſuffer; was the greateſt of their Sufferings*, p. 13. Which is a great Falſhood. Impriſonment was not the greateſt of their Sufferings, or of their Hardſhips. But the ſtrait and cloſe confinements dureſs and hardſhips which many ſuffered in noiſom Goals, whereby many loſt their Lives, and many their Healths impaired, beſides ſpoil of Goods ruining Families, and divers baniſhed out of their native Countries into foreign Iſlands and parts beyond Seas, as alſo cruel Whippings, Beatings, Stonings and other Barbarities which many have ſuffered from Perſecutors, pretending for the Church; theſe hardſhips were more than mere Impriſonments: To the ſhame of this Perſecutor and the reſt of his cruel Fraternity be it Spoken. His contemning and undervaluing our Sufferings will not extenuate their Cruelty and Perſecution.

22. *That* Iſaac Pennington *in his conſiderations concerning* Iſrael, p. 3. *gives that* (i. e. the Light within) *the preference to the diſpenſation of* Moſes *or of Chriſt*, p. 14. Which is falſe in the laſt; for Chriſt and his Light within are not divided, nor is his Light preferred to him, nor do we prefer any other Light than that of Chriſt to *Moſes*'s or any other diſpenſation or Miniſtry.

23. That

23. That *our Friends leave out whole Baſkets full of hideous Blaſphemies and Treaſons, i. e. out of the reprinted Works of their Prophets* (p. 14.)

Which is a moſt hideous and ſordid Calumny.

24. That *Edw. Burrough* in his *Epiſtle prefixed to G. F's Great Myſt.* (p. 7.) *extends this* (i. e. *Infallible diſcerning Spirit*) *to all and every of the Quakers; To us* (ſays he) *every one of us in particular. And this Light gave us to diſcern between Truth and Error, between every falſe and right way, and it perfectly diſcovered to us the true ſtate of all things*, p. 20. Upon peruſal of the place quoted in the ſaid Epiſtle, I do not find that *E. B.* extends the gift of diſcerning, to all and every of the Quakers, nor the diſcovery of the true ſtate of all things; herein are his words and intention perverted, tho' he confeſſes that every one has a true Light given by Chriſt, but not that every one has attained to the ſame gift of diſcerning of Spirits and States, Obſerve, 1. *E. B.* perſonates the converted and faithful among the Quakers, who walk in the Light which gives to diſcern between Truth and Error, the Right and the Wrong way; for whatſoever things are reproved are made manifeſt by the Light. 2dly, The perfect diſcovery of the true ſtate of *all Things*, He does in the place quoted,

reſtrict to the diſcovery of the Fall and reſtoration of Man, and to what's needful for Man to know (*i. e.* in reſpect to Salvation.) *Epiſ. to Gr. Myſt.* (p. 7, 8.) We are not to ſuppoſe that *By diſcovery of the true ſtate of all things*, he intended to aſcribe Omniſciency to us Creatures, no more than the Holy Apoſtle *John* did in the like Expreſſions. 1 *John* 2. 20. *But ye have an Unction from the Holy One, and ye know* all Things. And *verſe* 27. *But as the ſame Anointing teacheth you of* all Things, *and is Truth and is no Lye.* Theſe were all things needful for their Salvation and preſervation in Chriſt Jeſus. And herein in this divine Unction, and the teachings thereof ſtands the Infallibility, Certainty or aſſurance we plead for, and not in Man's Will, Wiſdom, Parts, or Acquirements. And as we keep in this Anointing received from the Holy One, we receive its Teachings which are true and certain, and ſo far partake of Certainty or Infallibility in what it Teacheth, being Truth and no Lye. But if any go from this Anointing into the Will or Wiſdom of Man or carnal Reaſonings, they go into uncertainty and ſo become fallible and ſubject to fall into Error; erring from this certain Principle produceth Error both in Judgment and many times in Practice. For 'tis *He that abideth in Chriſt that ſinneth not*, 1 *Joh.* 3.

3.6. And thoſe in whom this divine Anointing did abide who were taught by it, *As it taught them they did abide in him*, i. e. *in the Son of God*, ch. 2. 27. Who ſaith, *abide in me and I in you*, John 15. 4.

I find this Author to *the Snake in the Graſs*, is very apt frequently to miſrepreſent our Friends Words, which I cannot impute ſo much to his Ignorance, as Envious deſign to make us as Infamous and Odious as he can. As he has dealt by *E. B.* in the paſſage before, he has in like manner ſerv'd *Francis Howgil* in his Preface to *the Snake in the Graſs*, (p. 244.) Which I did not ſo much ſearch or remark in the foregoing Anſwer, as ſince. He charges *F. H.* with *Blaſphemy*, quoting, *p.* 232. of his Works, intitled, *The Dawning of the Goſpel-day*, where he ſaith, 'He 'that hath the Spirit of God, *is in THAT* 'which is Equal (*i. e.* as follows) he that is 'join'd to the Lord, is one Spirit, there 'is Unity, and the Unity ſtands in Equality 'it ſelf. Hence (and on ſome other words curtaliz'd and mangl'd) the ſaid Author infers, *viz.*

25. *Having thus made themſelves Equal to God in very Nature, it is not ſtrange to ſee them denying any other God or Chriſt but themſelves; they pull God out of Heaven*, &c. *Snake*, p. 245. Theſe Blaſphemous and general Inferences againſt the Quakers, as they

are utterly denyed by us, I find no just occasion for them, from *F. H*'s Words, if truly cited and considered, where he places the *Equality* between the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Spirit*: That which is *Equal*, he plainly speaks of the *Spirit* of *God* in the place quoted, and by the Unity [stands in Equality it self] he means no other, than that the Saints *Unity* stands in Christ, who is *Equal* with the Father, according to Christ's own Prayer, *John* 17. 21. *That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.* And *verse* 22. *And the Glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be One, as we are One.* And *verse* 23. *I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.*

That *F. H.* places the *Equality* in the *Son* of *God*, and on his part, is evident by his following Words, (left out by the said Author) *viz.* 'He that is born from above, 'is the Son of God, and he said, I and my 'Father are one; and when the Son is re-'veal'd and speaks, the Father speaks in 'him, and dwells in him, and he in the Fa-'ther.

Now, though the Saints cannot claim to themselves that *Equality* the *Son* of *God* (who is their Head) hath; yet who can in Truth deny their being made *Partakers* of the *Di-*

vine

vine Nature and Union in Chriſt Jeſus, and holy Spirit with the Father?

The account which this Author of the *Snake* hath given againſt *Tho. Curtis*, p. 20, 21, 22. which he ſaith, *he has ſeen under the hand of* W. Clark, I do ſomewhat Queſtion the Truth of divers Paſſages in it, as whether *T. C.* is not therein miſ-repreſented; though I cannot from my own knowledge refute them, yet 'tis very ſtrange that *T. C.* ſhould be repreſented ſo very groſly Ignorant, as in that ſaid Account, (but I am ſure 'tis a groſs Lye, that the Quakers do hold, or have always held theſe Hereſies charged on him) or that *G. Keith* ſhould ſuffer him to be ſo foully expos'd in print; if he was privy thereto, I am apt to think 'twas a piece of great *Incivility*, as well as *Ingratitude* and Treachery againſt *T. C.* to ſerve him ſuch an ill turn.

26. *That he would not leſſen the Sufferings of the Quakers*, (p. 13.) is a notorious Falſhood, as his ſcoffing at, and vilifying them, and rendring *many of them to have ſuffer'd for open and notorious Blaſphemy* (p. 12.) doth evince.

27. *That* Mary Fell, *after ſhe was Married to* G. F. *became the Mother of the* Quakers *Church*, (p. 17.) is a ſcornful Falſhood, we have not given her, or any other Woman that Title; though ſhe and many more

faithful Women have been own'd as *Mothers* in *Iſrael*; but *Jeruſalem*, that is above, the *Mother* of us all.

28. *That many of the generality of the* Quakers *do ſtick in the very bottom of that ſink of Hereſies, which they have been taught; and that their Leaders go about to juſtify, excuſe and palliate them*, (p. 18.) Theſe proceed from the *Sink* of his groſs Calumnies and Malice.

29. *That the* Quakers *yearly Epiſtle, directed to all* Quakers *throughout the World, is their ſupream Law*, (p. 18.) is falſe again, we know no ſuch Epiſtle, that is ſo eſteem'd our ſupream Law; but rather Epiſtles proceeding from our *ſupream Law* of *Love*.

30. *That 'tis only for placing their Faith in the outward* Jeſus, *that the* Quakers *have ſo condemned them*, (i.e. the Prieſts) (p. 19.) This is not true again, 'tis not for placing their *Faith* (if it were really ſo) in an outward *Jeſus*, or rather Jeſus without them; but for their dead Faith without Chriſt, and without Works and Fruit; and their many Corruptions, as *Pride*, *Covetouſneſs*, *Perſecution*, &c. as juſtly Chargeable on many of them.

His ſtory about one *Archer* in *Wilts*, queſtioning, *whether he was not among the Quaker-Biſhops, who compos'd this laſt general Council?* (p. 19.) is very ſcurrilous and falſe, as it is turned to affect the *Quakers*. We don't underſtand he was here at *London*, the laſt Yearly Meeting.

The

The other *story* thereupon concerning the ſaid *Arober*, That *the Knaves of that Country* [after his Wickedneſs] *forced him to ſhift his Quarters, and that then he came up to* London, *to which the other* Quakers *gave the right hand of Fellowſhip; and that there he Preach'd and exerciſed his Talent with great Approbation*, p. 19, 20. Though we have heard of ſuch an one's miſcarriage, yet I have enquir'd, and am perſwaded, the latter part of the *ſtory* is a great *Forgery*, to ſcandalize the *Quakers*, that either they gave him the right hand of Fellowſhip, or that he preached at *London* with great Approbation, after he fled upon diſcovery; this is a very unlikely ſtory, baſely deſigned to caſt Dirt upon us; for the World well knows our Chriſtian care to expunge ſuch from our Society, upon the knowledge of their Enormities; but whether there be the like care and practice in this Authors Church, he may conſider if he will.

Reader,

I Have in this precedent Examination, paſſed by a great many more falſe Aſperſions, Calumnies and Perverſions caſt up-

on my ſelf and divers others in the ſaid Book, *Satan Diſrob'd*; being not willing to undertake a full Anſwer to it, nor to ſpend more time in raking in ſuch dirty Kennels of Lyes and Abuſes, as the Books of the ſaid Author are ſtuff'd withal againſt us, *&c.*

There are alſo many Falſhoods, foul Perverſions, Charges and Reflections, in *The Snake in the Graſs*, not particularly Remarked in the foregoing Antidote, and in particular divers Paſſages, relating to the Revolution of Governments in the Nation; the ſubſtance whereof, I long ſince fully Anſwer'd to *John Pennyman*'s Invectives. My Anſwer is Intitul'd, *Chriſt*'s *Lambs defended from Satan*'s *Rage*, Printed for *Tho. Northcott* in *George-Yard*, in *Lumbard-ſtreet*, London.

'Tis obſervable, that the ſaid *Author* of *The Snake in the Graſs*, values himſelf much upon that *Title* to ſeveral of his Books againſt us; but upon the Readers peruſal of theſe already Anſwered, it will appear, that *Title* will be his great *Diſgrace* and *Infamy*; ſeeing that he has merited the Character of *a Hatcher* of *Cockatrice Eggs*, as well as the *Author* of *The Snake in the Graſs:* Which *Title*, he may be as horribly aſham'd of, as afraid to expoſe his real name and place.

SOME

Some notice taken of the ſaid Author's Diſcourſe for Water Baptiſm.

HAving lately ſeen and received a Book ſtiled, *A Diſcourſe proving the divine Inſtitution of Water-Baptiſm*, &c. *By the Author of The Snake in the Graſs*, and finding theſe Paſſages after the Contents, *viz.*

'That there will be publiſhed a Diſ-'courſe by the ſame Author, ſhewing, 'whom Chriſt hath ordain'd to Admini-'ſter the Sacraments in his Church. And another, *wherein is proved, that the chief of the* Quakers *Hereſies, were broached and condemn'd in the days of the Apoſtles, and in the firſt* 150 *Years after Chriſt.*

To the latter part whereof, I muſt tell him, and Advertiſe the Reader, that this officious Author ſhould have ſpared his other Diſcourſe, thus Charging the Quakers with Hereſies, ſo long ſince broached and condemned, until he had ſeen an Anſwer to his *Snake in the Graſs*, wherein he hath moſt unjuſtly and falſly Charged the Quakers with numerous Hereſies and Errors (as alſo he hath in divers things very falſly aſpers'd them in this Diſcourſe.) And

if

if he repeat the ſame again upon us, (as it may be ſuſpected) to prove them ſo long ſince broached and condemned; this will add nothing of proof, that we the People called Quakers are guilty thereof, but only ſerve to ſhew his own Malice and Impertinency and groſs Calumnies already confuted. Upon the viewing his ſaid Diſcourſe for Water-Baptiſm, I find nothing material, but what is moſtly anſwer'd in the foregoing *Treatiſe*, and Book therein referred unto in page 126. Beſides, I find him very much impoſing and begging the Queſtion in his ſaid Diſcourſe, 1ſt. Pleading for *Infant Baptiſm* in his Preface, as being *the outward Seal of* Chriſt's *Covenant*, (but without Scripture proof) and then flees to the Baptiſts Arguments, for Baptizing Believers or People Docible, from *Mat.* 28. and other Scriptures, which they uſe to urge in oppoſition to ſprinkling Infants.

He miſerably impoſes in placing upon outward Baptiſm, all theſe Priviledges, *viz. Regeneration*, or *being Born into the Church*, *Baptizing into the Chriſtian Faith*, (p. 9, 10.) *The Promiſe of the Inward Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt*, (p. 12.) Calling the outward, *The means whereby we are made partakers of the inward, and whereby the inward Baptizm of the Holy Ghoſt is given*, p. 34, 60. All this he places upon outward *Baptiſm with Water*:

But

But then it muſt be upon the *duly receiving* thereof, (p. 12.) wherein he hath before included Infants as well as others, but all this without Scripture Proof. Now if all thoſe Infants that are Sprinkled or Baptized be Regenerated and Born again and Baptized into the Faith, and partakers of the Holy Ghoſt and the Baptiſm thereof; How will this agree or conſiſt with their Preaching the neceſſity of Regeneration, and the new Birth to ſuch when docible, ſeeing he ſaith, a Man can be but once Regenerated, (p. 9.) I find that when he pleads for Baptizing Believers, (p. 23.) he cannot eſcape the Baptiſt's Arguments, altho' he hath reviled them as badly in a manner as he hath done us, as is before ſhewed.

I find that Text, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. doth Puzzle him, eſteeming it an *obſcure Text*, p. 22. Which is, *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize*, &c. and he is very impertinent, and begging the Queſtion in his Anſwer to it.

But while he Argues with the Baptiſts Arguments for Believers Baptizm, I take it for granted, that he Argues for that, which he and his Brethren the Clergy are out of the practice of, and therefore *inſincere*, and conſequently his Works deſerves to be rejected whilſt Infants are the Subjects chiefly intended.

He

He bitterly exclaims against both *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, *Quakers*, *Socinians*, *Unitarians*, *Latitudinarians* and *Deists*, &c. in his Preface, as being *the Spawn of Rebellion and multifarious Schism*, (and especially against the *Presbytery in Scotland*) either for their Indifferency or disuse of Water Baptizm, &c. See what a busy Agent this is, as if he would have his Hand against every Man: But I must leave him for others concerned to deal with him, if they see it worth their Time and Labour: I having bestowed more for the Truth sake (and for the sake of many more sincere than himself) than he or his Works deserve.

G. W.

The

The Contents of the foregoing Treatiſe.

	Page.
What Characters are given againſt the People called Quakers, by *The Snake in the Graſs*, examined.	1 to 12.
A Catalogue of ſome abuſes againſt the ſaid People.	13 to 49.
Concerning Tithes, and a Popiſh Plea for the ſame, confuted by Martyrs and primitive Proteſtants.	17 to 23.
A falſe Charge againſt *G. Fox*, &c. Examin'd and Anſwer'd.	25, 26.
Of the Man Chriſt, his Body and Blood.	29 to 35.
Of the holy Scriptures, how own'd by the People called Quakers, and they cleared from Calumnies in that point.	35, 36. 40, 41.
Our Accuſers Hiporitical Prayer.	37.
Of Chriſts' Body, Fleſh (the Vail) and Blood.	38, 39.
For the Divine authority of the H. Scriptures.	42, 43.
Our Adverſarys falſe pretence of kindneſs.	44, 45.
Chriſt's exiſtence or being, and how he is in us.	45, 46.
Of the Quakers general Anſwer to the ſeven Queries, and of *G. Keith*'s abuſe thereupon.	46 to 49.
The ſecond part begins, with Reflection upon the Presbyterians, Independents and the Quakers, rendering them all obnoxious, *&c.*	50 51.
The Quakers clear'd from the *Arians* Hereſie.	52 53.
An unjuſt compariſon and railery againſt the Quakers	54, 55.
Both Presbyter, Anabaptiſt, Independent and Quakers, ſcandalized, and their liberty envied, by the Author of *The Snake in the Graſs.*	56, 57.
Popiſh Emiſſaries no promoters of Quakeriſm.	57, 58.
Of the more peculiar Titles of Chriſt not given to us.	59, 60.

Of

	Page.
Of the Soul of Man being created, and the divine breath or Spirit of Life, which God breathed into Man.	61, 62.
Of Infallibly and Omniſciency	62 63.
Of the Light given of God to our Souls.	63 to 66.
Of diſcerning of Spirits, how a gift.	67 to 72.
Occaſion given us to reflect on the incontinency of Prieſts.	73, 74.
The ſaid Authors general and falſe Charge about one falſe Prophet, and Story of a Glover in Cheapſide, &c.	75 to 78.
His Reflection upon all diſſenting Proteſtants, and pleading for Biſhops, wicked Prieſts and perſecuting Kings.	78 to 80.
Our Friends miſrepreſented about G. K. and of the Text, 1 Joh. 1. 7.	81, 82.
Of our preferring the Spirit to the Letter, no contempt of Holy Scripture.	82 to 86.
Of *Enthuſiaſm* as charg'd againſt the Quakers.	86 to 89.
Of Womens Preaching, and Womens Meetings.	89, 90.
Our Doctrin concerning the Light within, vindicated and opened.	90 to 99.
The Quakers vindicated from ſeveral Blaſphemous Charges, as aſſuming divine Attributes, divine Worſhip, divine Honour.	99 to 101.
Of the Reſurrection, Heaven and Glory, how Scripturally confeſſed and believed by us.	102 to 111.
Of the Sacraments ſo called, firſt of the Supper, ſecond of Baptiſm.	111 to 126.
Concerning the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.	127 to 135.
Concerning the holy Trinity.	135 to 140.
For the Divinity and Incarnation of Chriſt alſo.	140 to 155.

Some

	Page.
Some Remarks by the Author of the *Snake* against *G. Whitehead*, examined, as about *Christ*, *the holy Scriptures*, *the Word*, *the Light*, &c.	155 to 174.
The words, *Type*, *Figure*, *Shape*, *Example*, *Vail*, *most holy places*, both in the old and new Covenant opened.	174 to 182.
A brief Examination of some passages in the second Book, stil'd, *Satan Disrob'd*.	185.
Some reasons for excepting against the Term *Co-creator*.	188 to 191.
Of the Soul and Incarnation of Christ.	191 to 193.
A question about the manner of some Men's carnally looking for Christ to Salvation, who neglect his inward appearance; and for what end his spiritual Appearance is truly expected.	193 to 197.
Of Christ as at God's right hand, and in his People.	197 to 199.
Of Christ's Appearance at the great day in his glorious spiritual Body, and of the Resurrection Bodies.	199 to 207.
Of Christ's existence in Heaven, as at the right hand of God, and of God's Omni-presence, and indweling in his People.	207 to 209.
Of the pure Nature of Christ, and of some sin-pleasing notions repugnant thereto, and to his inward Appearance and Operations of his Spirit.	209 to 212.
Of the *Historical* Faith of Christ's death for Sinners, and the *saving* Faith in his Light.	212 to 217.
Christ's obedience unto death for us *Meritorious*, but not the Act of wicked hands, either in murthering him, or sheding his blood by the Spear upon the Cross.	217 to 220.

The

The Contents.

The price and *work* of our Redemption by Jesus Christ.	Page. 220 to 221.
Of the *Object* and *Foundation* of *true Faith* in Christ, and of his blood that was shed; an unwarrantable comparison disown'd concerning the same.	221 to 225.
Of the material, and mystical blood of Christ, and the Type thereof, and shadow of Heavenly things which the Law had.	227 to 231.
Of God's own blood, *Acts* 20. 28. And Redemption explained with respect both to the *Satrifice* and *Work* of Christ.	232 to 237.
Of the words Personality, Personal, Existence and Humane, as ascribed to Christ, &c. why question'd, Christ's coming to Judgment, the Resurrection, &c. how own'd.	237 to 240.
Some notorious Lyes and Perversions, gleaned out of the said Book, *Satan Disrobed*.	241 to 245.
Some gleanings of Lyes, Slanders and Perversions, out of the some gleanings of the Author to *The Snake in the Grass*, recharged on him.	246 to 263.
Some notice taken of the said Author's Discourse for Water-Baptism.	266. &c.

FINIS.

UMI